DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 427 UD 028 989

AUTHOR	Watson, Bernardine H.
TITLE	Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project: Initial Implementation Report.
INSTITUTION	Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	AT&T Foundation, New York, NY.; Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; Food and Nutrition Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Kaiser Foundation, Oakland, Calif.; Levi Strauss Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	91p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Public/Private Ventures, 399 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106-2178.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Black Youth; Disadvantaged Youth; Employment Opportunities; *Fathers; Individual Characteristics; Job Placement; *Job Training; One Parent Family; Parent Child Relationship; *Parenthood Education; Parent Participation; *Pilot Projects; Profiles; Program Descriptions; *Program Implementation; *Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS	African Americans; *Unmarried Parents

ABSTRACT

This interim report documents early experiences with recruitment, retention, service delivery, and establishment of links with employment/training and child support enforcement agencies for participants in the first year of a young unwed fathers program; and presents a profile of the 228 young fathers who had enrolled in the program by the end of February of 1992. The program is described as implemented at six sites where job training services, educational services, fatherhood development training, counseling, and 18-month on-going support are offered. Of the report's five sections, the first is an introduction offering background information, the second looks at problems of recruitment and retention, the third describes characteristics of those enrolled in the program, the fourth describes project organization and services, and the fifth summarizes initial findings. Among the findings are the following: (1) attracting and enrolling young fathers are difficult and resource-intensive undertakings; (2) most unwed young fathers are too poor to support their children on a regular basis; and (3) access to Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) resources appears critical to service delivery for young unwed fathers, however, current regulations and practice in both JTPA programs and Child Support Enforcement (CSE) Programs, and the limited coordination between the two systems, present barriers to service delivery for this population. Included are 15 data tables. Appendixes contain site profiles, site summaries, a description of the study methodology, and a fatherhood development curriculum outline. (JB)

Public/Private Ventures

P/PV

ED352427

Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project

Initial Implementation Report

Bernardine H. Watson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Jaffe
Public/Private Ventures

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 028 989

Fall 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public/Private Ventures is a national, not-for-profit corporation that designs, manages, and evaluates social policy initiatives aimed at helping youth whose lack of preparation for the work force hampers their chances for productive lives. P/PV's work is supported by funds from both the public and private sectors.

Rex D. Adams
Chairman of the Board

Michael A. Bailin
President

Gary Walker
Executive Vice President

Board of Directors
Rex D. Adams
William R. Anton
Michael A. Bailin
Angela Glover Blackwell
Roy J. Bostock
Alan K. Campbell
Hillary Rodham Clinton
Alonzo A. Crim
Alice F. Emerson
Sandra Feldman
Mitchell S. Fromstein
David W. Hornbeck
Harold Howe II
Siobhan Oppenheimer-Nicolau
Marion Pines
John W. Porter
Harold Richman
Mitchell Sviridoff

Corporate Associates
American Express Philanthropic Program
Ameritech Foundation
ARA Services, Inc.
Borden Foundation
BP America
Citibank
D'Arcy, Masius, Benton and Bowles
Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.
Exxon Corporation
Mobil Foundation, Inc.
Penn Mutual Charitable Trust
The Prudential Foundation
Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.
United Technologies

Research Advisory Committee
Frank Furstenberg
Robinson Hollister
Henry Levin
Frank Levy
Anita Summers
Marta Tienda

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2178
215 592-9099

P/PV

Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project

Initial Implementation Report

Bernardine H. Watson

Fall 1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Young Unwed Fathers Project and its reports, of which this is the first, are made possible by the generous support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, The Ford Foundation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Division of Food and Nutrition Services, the U.S. Department of Labor, the Levi Strauss Foundation, the Kaiser Family Foundation and the AT&T Foundation. We are grateful for their interest in this important project.

Alvia Y. Branch was responsible for the initial framework of the research design. Mary Achatz finalized the design and, along with Cynthia L. Sipe and Crystal Mecartney, completed the data collection instruments and oversaw the data collection efforts across the six project sites. Dr. Sipe and the MIS staff were particularly helpful in responding to numerous requests for the quantitative data needed for this report.

Tom Flood and Nigel Vann conducted interviews with staff at the project sites and collaborating agencies, which provided essential information and flavor for this report. We particularly wish to thank Natalie Jaffe, whose insights and editing of numerous drafts brought overall clarity and organization to the final text; and Mike Bailin, Gary Walker and all of the P/PV staff mentioned above, especially Nigel Vann, who reviewed the report in various stages of completion and provided invaluable input. Carol Schutzbank provided overall secretarial and administrative support and, along with Maxine Sherman, processed the report's several drafts. The production team also included Michael Callaghan (copy-editing), Robert Henry (design of the tables), and Carol Eresian (proofreading).

Invaluable assistance and advice on various programmatic and research issues were provided throughout by members of the Young Fathers Advisory Group: Stanley Battle, Irwin Garfinkel, Lawrence E. Gary, Karen Pittman, Donald Polk, Digna Sanchez, Mercer Sullivan and Raphael Valdivieso. Others who have lent us their wisdom and support at crucial intervals include Frank Furstenberg of the University of Pennsylvania and Rebecca Maynard of Mathematica Policy Research. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Pamela Wilson and Jeffrey Johnson for their work on the Young Fathers Curriculum and help in developing the overall fatherhood component of the project.

The staff at the six Young Fathers sites have not only our thanks for their cooperation in the development of the project and the conduct of the study, but also our admiration for the work they are doing with the young men who have come through their doors. We are especially grateful to the young fathers who came forward to participate in the project, responded so readily to our requests for sometimes very personal information, and permitted us to use this information in our research.

CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

I. INTRODUCTION 1
- The Problem and Its Consequences 2
- Young Fathers: Current Knowledge and Services 3
- The Pilot Project 6
- Research Agenda 10

II. RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT: CAN PROJECTS ATTRACT YOUNG FATHERS? 13
- The Sites' Recruitment Strategies and Their Implementation 15
- Conclusion 24

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE YOUNG UNWED FATHERS WHO ENROLLED IN THE PROJECT SITES 25
- Basic Demographics and Life Circumstances 25
- Relationships With Mother and Children 28
- Sexual Practices and Family Planning 32
- Conclusion 32

IV. MEETING THE NEEDS OF YOUNG FATHERS: PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND SERVICES 33
- Training, Education and Jobs 33
- Fatherhood Development Activities 48
- Counseling and Other Ongoing Support 57
- Establishing a Long-Term Connection 58
- Conclusion 58

V. SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS 61
- Next Steps for the Pilot 65

REFERENCES 67

APPENDIX A: SITE PROFILES
APPENDIX B: SITE SUMMARY
APPENDIX C: METHODOLOGY
APPENDIX D: FATHERHOOD DEVELOPMENT CURRICULUM OUTLINE

TABLES

		Page
1.	ENROLLMENT HISTORY THROUGH FEBRUARY 1992	14
2.	ENROLLMENT BUILD-UP THROUGH FEBRUARY 1992	14
3.	HOW ENROLLEES FIRST HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM	16
4.	FATHERS' REASONS FOR ENROLLING	17
5.	DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS	26
6.	PARTICIPANTS' RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUNGEST CHILD'S MOTHER AT TIME OF PREGNANCY AND AT TIME OF SURVEY	30
7.	PARTICIPANTS' FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH YOUNGEST CHILD	30
8.	JTPA-CERTIFICATION AND DATA ON EDUCATION AND JOB-READINESS BY SITE	35
9.	FATHERS' WORK HISTORY DURING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION	41
10.	WAGES AND HOURS--FIRST JOB (AS OF FEBRUARY 1992)	42
11.	HEALTH BENEFITS--FIRST JOB	42
12.	HOW PARTICIPANTS OBTAINED FIRST JOB BY SITE	43
13.	JOB RETENTION BY SITE	46
14.	CURRICULUM ATTENDANCE BY MONTH OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION	51
15.	PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT BY SITE	53

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public/Private Ventures' Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project is an attempt to focus the attention of policymakers, the employment and training field, and the public on disadvantaged young men who become fathers at an early age, by testing strategies for increasing their capacity to form families and care for their children as providers and parents.

The project is supported by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, The Ford Foundation, Levi Strauss Foundation, Kaiser Family Foundation, Scott Paper Company Foundation, AT&T Foundation, the United States Department of Labor and the United States Department of Agriculture's Division of Food and Nutrition Services.

As of February 1992, six sites had completed 10 to 12 months of the project's initial 30-month pilot phase. The sites are: Cleveland Works in Cleveland, Ohio; Goodwill Industries in Racine, Wisconsin; the Fresno Private Industry Council (PIC) in Fresno, California; the Pinellas County PIC in St. Petersburg, Florida; Friends of the Family and the Department of Social Services in Annapolis, Maryland; and the Philadelphia Children's Network in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

THE CONTEXT

The economic, personal and social position of millions of young men from poor families in America--primarily in its cities--has only recently become a prominent part of the nation's social policy debate. The lack of connection between these young men and the labor market is increasingly seen to be near the heart of at least three large issues of current concern:

- Children born out of wedlock now constitute the majority of children receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); and it is estimated that more than 40 percent of never-married women who enter the AFDC system by age 25 with a child less than three years old will spend 10 years or more on welfare.

- While teenage pregnancy and childbearing rates are going down, the United States still has the highest rates among developed Western countries and the rates for unmarried teenagers continue to rise (up from 68,000 births in 1960 to 348,000 in 1989).

- The percentage of families headed by women has grown, from 21 percent to 31 percent of all families between 1970 and 1988, and fewer than half the nine million women with children who maintain single-parent households report getting support from the fathers. Never-married teen mothers are among the groups that are least likely to receive child support and most likely to be poor.

To date, most of the policy response to adolescent childbearing, and its relationship to poverty and welfare dependency, has focused on the mothers and babies, ignoring the fathers of the children. These young men have generally not been eligible for income support programs, especially with the reductions in state General Assistance rolls over the past several years. Few public employment and training programs have been designed specifically to attract and serve them.

Increasingly, advocacy groups like the Children's Defense Fund and social scientists like William Julius Wilson, who have studied the relationship between economic conditions and family formation, have hypothesized that growing joblessness--and other trends related to incarceration and mortality--particularly among black men, has played a key role in increasing the incidence of single-parent families by reducing the pool of "marriageable men." Over the past decade, the earnings of black males between the ages of 20 and 24 fell by more than half as structural changes in the economy increased their joblessness; one in four of these young men (more in inner cities) are in jail, on probation or parole; and their mortality rates are high compared to those of other groups. Nevertheless there has been no significant public policy response.

THE PILOT PROJECT

Given the limited experience that programs have had with young fathers, and the field's limited knowledge about the type of services that would engage and benefit them, P/PV determined that a test of various local service delivery approaches was needed to provide comparative information for policymakers and the field. Therefore, participating sites were given broad flexibility in designing programs. However, based on the knowledge available about programming for high-risk young men, and the issues we wanted to explore about this population, we hypothesized that programs would be most likely to produce benefits for young unwed fathers if they incorporate the following five principles:

1. Use of the JTPA system to provide young fathers with training services that would lead to good jobs. We define good jobs as those that provide benefits and opportunities for advancement and have the potential for enabling fathers to support themselves and their children.

2. The delivery of education services designed to improve the earning capacity of young fathers.

3. The delivery of "fatherhood development" activities that encourage parental values, capabilities and behavior in young men, including a *Fatherhood Development Curriculum* developed by P/PV, "leadership" activities, and work with fathers to establish paternity and pay formal child support.

4. The provision of counseling and other ongoing support designed to help fathers achieve employment, parenting and personal goals.

5. The establishment of an 18-month connection with fathers so that services and support continue after job placement.

The six sites vary in their service delivery mechanisms, resource levels, geographic locations and models for implementing the project requirements. In keeping with our desire to test local systems' response to serving young fathers, P/PV provided a small seed grant of $55,000 to each site: $50,000 to support project operations and $5,000 to stimulate fatherhood development activity. The pilot phase will determine which models and/or program elements appear to produce the best outcomes for this population, and whether an impact analysis of any one model would be useful.

This interim report documents the sites' early experiences with recruitment, retention, service delivery and establishment of linkages with employment/training and child support enforcement agencies; presents a profile of the 228 young fathers who had enrolled by the end of February 1992; and explores issues raised by the sites' early experiences. Outcomes and cost analyses will not be available until the final report on the pilot phase, to be published in Fall 1993.

EARLY FINDINGS

- **The recruitment experience thus far confirms that attracting and enrolling young fathers, even in programs specifically designed for them, is difficult and resource-intensive, at least in the initial operating period.**

The first challenge to the project was attracting a group of young men who traditionally have little connection with education, employment and training agencies. Each pilot site was required to enroll 50 young unwed fathers.

Each site relied primarily on one of three strategies: mandatory referrals from the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) agency (Racine), voluntary referrals from CSE (Fresno and St. Petersburg), and community outreach (Cleveland, Philadelphia and Annapolis). The program effort and resources required by the six sites to attract even modest numbers were initially significant and daunting. By the end of the first year of operation, only one site had reached the enrollment goal.

Over time, young fathers did enroll and referral agencies did refer--in increasing numbers as the programs became better known. But even increasing success did not provide strong evidence that enrollment would ever be a low-cost function or that large numbers could ever be easily enrolled. There are indications, however, that the recruitment of young fathers is facilitated when the agency or its staff has already established "credibility" with the population; and/or the agency's ability to generate good jobs is well known; and/or its collaboration with the CSE and employment training (JTPA) agencies has been lengthy and proven mutually useful.

Nearly half (46.3%) of the enrollees were referred to the sites by other institutions: 26.9 percent by their local child support office; another 9.3 percent by other agencies, juvenile court or a probation officer; and another 10.1 percent by a teacher, counselor or social worker. Close to one-quarter (22.5%) of the fathers cited personal contacts as the source of information--either another father (10.6%), friend or relative (11.9%). Program staff and flyers also played an important role in attracting fathers (22%). Less significant across the six sites was the role of media; only 7 percent said they heard about the project from newspapers or television. Very few fathers (2.2%) said they learned about the project from their girlfriends.

Many fathers responded to the project's fatherhood focus. Close to 40 percent indicated that they enrolled to improve their relationships with their children, and nearly half said they wanted to improve their parenting skills. Staff credit the fatherhood focus for the project's initial retention rate of 81 percent across the six sites.

- **The demographic characteristics of the project sample corroborate findings from the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Behavior of Youth, which found that young men who are African American, have educational deficiencies and come from poor economic circumstances are disproportionately represented among those who become fathers at an early age.**

Close to three-quarters of the young men in the study sample are African American. More than half (52.8%) report that they live in households with annual incomes below $10,000; the average household size is four; 61.5 percent of the households are on welfare; and half receive food stamps.

Forty-three percent of the sample has less than an 11th-grade education; 24 percent had earned a high school diploma and 11 percent a GED at the time of program entry. The fathers reported very sparse labor market experiences: the majority (77%) were unemployed on program entry, and those who were employed expressed dissatisfaction with pay, benefits and opportunities for advancement. As evidence of their distance from the employment and training system, 84 percent reported that they had not been involved in a training program in the past three years, though 23 percent were at entry in an education program or still in high school. More than half (58%) said they had male family members or friends in their 20s and 30s who were neither in school or working.

- **The living arrangements of a significant portion of the project sample are indicative of fragile economic circumstances and uncertain job prospects, but also point to their connection to their families. Their living arrangements also vary significantly by race.**

More than half (55%) of the young men reported that they lived in households with at least one of their parents or other relatives. Twenty-eight percent lived in households with at least one of their children, and 23 percent lived with their girlfriend and

child(ren). White fathers were less likely (44%) to live with parents than African-American or Latino fathers (56% and 54% respectively). Also, more Latino fathers (44%) reported living in a household with one or more of their children, compared with 25 percent of African-American fathers and 28 percent of white fathers.

- **The information reported by the fathers does not support the view that young fathers are responsible for multiple births; that their relationships with their children's mothers are casual; and that they are "absent" from the lives of their children.**

Among the fathers in the sample, 63 percent reported having only one child; 82 percent reported that they had children by only one mother. Although only 3 percent of fathers reported that they were married to the mother of their child at the time she became pregnant, half (50%) said they had been in a "serious romance" with the mother and nearly one-third (30%) said this relationship was current. Only 1 percent said they had not been in a relationship with the mother at all; 3 percent reported they knew the mother "only a little."

When asked about contact with their children, a large majority of respondents (75%) reported visiting their child in the hospital when he or she was born; 85 percent said they were listed on the child's birth certificate. As mentioned earlier, 23 percent indicated that they lived in the same household with their child and their child's mother, and 26 percent reported living in the same household with their child.

Additional data were collected on fathers' involvement with their children and some of their attitudes about fatherhood. Of those who do not live with their children, 39 percent responded that in the past month they had seen their children "almost every day"; 70 percent said they had seen them at least once a week. Even more revealing of the role that many of these fathers play in the lives of their children are their activities when they are together. More than 50 percent said they took their child to the doctor; and large percentages reported bathing (46%), feeding (81%), dressing (73%) and playing with (87%) their child.

- **The young fathers in the sample reported spending significant amounts of money on their children, often over and above formal child support payments.**

The fathers were asked about the kind and amount of financial support they provide for their children. Thirty percent reported having child support orders; the average order reported was $118 a month. Seventy-one percent of these fathers said they were behind in their child support payments.

Not including formal child support payments, fathers reported paying directly for food, clothing, diapers and medicine. Also, 49 percent of the fathers indicated that they gave additional money each month to the mother or person caring for their child.

Although these data are all self-reported, and should therefore be viewed cautiously, the findings are significant in that fathers with and without child support orders, and in spite *of their own poor economic circumstances, indicate a willingness to provide support to* their children.

If the reported figures are even close to accurate, it appears that fathers whose children are receiving AFDC (49 percent in this sample) and who do not have child support orders, may be able to provide a substantial supplement to the AFDC grant, at least on an irregular basis. However, by declaring paternity and taking on formal child support obligations, as this project encourages such fathers to do, they become open to legal liability if they fall behind on their payments. They also may reduce the income of the household in which their children live because the "pass through" of the total child support payment collected from the father is only $50 a month, substantially less than the fathers in our project report providing for their children's care. One of the many challenges this population presents to the project and to public policy generally is how to convince economically insecure young fathers to establish paternity and pay legal child support when they may already be providing what they can "off the books," even on an irregular basis.

- **The most established and experienced site operators with strong access to the local public employment/training agency have done the best overall job so far of delivering employment and training services to young fathers. But even in these cases, the services offered have been constrained by public agency rules that work against the long-term goals of financial self-sufficiency for fathers and their families.**

The sites were required to use the federal employment and training system (programs funded by the Job Training Partnership Act) to provide fathers with training and good jobs. Only the most established program operators (in Cleveland, Racine and Fresno) with experience working with high-risk populations and strong ties to the JTPA system have been able to package services for this population. But even they have not been able to provide large numbers of young fathers with promising jobs or skills training.

Limitations in the usefulness of JTPA-funded programs for these young men include local eligibility criteria or practices that screen out many needy fathers, the lack of viable skills training options (including on-the-job training) for these men, and the lack of in-program financial support that forces fathers to take jobs before they improve their job-related skills.

Limitations also result from the common CSE agency practice of pressing even those young fathers enrolled in programs to "pay up" on their child support arrears. This often causes the young men to leave programs and take jobs too soon, in order to avoid accumulating large debts to the state or, in some jurisdictions, face jail for noncompliance.

Whether passage of the 1992 JTPA amendments will strengthen services for young fathers or facilitate the participation of organizations with access to young fathers remains to be seen, as does the usefulness for this population of the Family Support Act's Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program--something that is being tested in the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration.

In sum, the young men who have enrolled in P/PV's Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project are, for the most part, doing too poorly economically to support their children on a regular basis, but provide sporadic support and are eager for better jobs and for contact with their children. In attempting to respond, the six sites' early experience shows that access to public employment/training (JTPA) resources is critical. Current regulations and practice in both JTPA and Child Support Enforcement agencies, and the limited coordination between the young fathers' programs and the public agencies, and between public agencies like CSE and JTPA, present serious barriers to both enrollment and service delivery.

As the project's pilot phase continues through August 1993, particular research emphasis will be on assessing the effects of the fatherhood focus on both retention and outcomes for the young men, identifying specific barriers to enrollment and interagency coordination issues that can be resolved, measuring the sites' ability to help participants move toward permanent employment, and understanding better both the strengths and problems of the young men themselves.

I. INTRODUCTION

Public/Private Ventures' (P/PV's) Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project is testing programmatic approaches to improving the capacity of young unwed fathers to care for their children, both as providers and parents. These young men are known to the public as the "absent" fathers of children who live with their mothers, many of whom are on welfare.

We know that nearly six million mothers on welfare receive no legally ordered support from the fathers of their children (Veum, 1992). But the number of fathers involved is unknown, as are the reasons for their official "absence" and, therefore, which strategies could be effective in achieving their physical and/or financial presence in the family.

The project aims to fill these gaps in knowledge. It is enrolling the young segment of the absent father population--16- to 25-year-olds--for 18 months; collecting information on their problems and potential as responsible parents; and testing the capacity of local agencies to provide them with employment training, basic education, more effective parenting skills and personal counseling.

The Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project is supported by six foundations--the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, The Ford Foundation, the Levi Strauss Foundation, the Kaiser Family Foundation, the AT&T Foundation and the Scott Paper Company Foundation--as well as by the Department of Labor, which is particularly interested in the role of the public employment/training system in working with young unwed fathers, and the Department of Agriculture's Division of Food and Nutrition Services, which operates the federal food stamp program.

By February 1992, six sites representing a variety of service delivery organizations, resource levels, geographic locations and implementation schemes had completed 10 to 12 months of the demonstration's 30-month pilot phase, which will continue through August 1993. The goal of this phase is to determine which models and/or program elements appear to be most feasible and produce the best outcomes for this population, and whether an impact analysis of any model would be useful.

This interim report documents the sites' early experiences with recruitment, retention, service delivery and establishment of linkages with other agencies; presents a profile of the young fathers who have enrolled; and explores the issues raised by the sites' early experiences. Outcomes and cost analyses will not be available until the conclusion of the demonstration's pilot phase.

As the report details, efforts to involve low-income young fathers in programs and give them the wherewithal to support their children are seriously challenged by current welfare and job training regulations and the need to coordinate the functions of welfare,

child support and employment training programs to assist them. The project is telling us a great deal about both the problems and strengths of this particular group of young men, and the special needs that must be addressed if they are to become more responsible parents.

THE PROBLEM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The National Center for Health Statistics reports that between 1960 and 1989, the number of births to teens declined from nearly 600,000 per year to 518,000 per year, but the number of births to unmarried teens increased from 68,000 to 348,000 per year--or 67 percent of all births to teenage mothers. Among black teens, this percentage is even higher: 89 percent of births among black teens in 1983 involved unmarried mothers (Children's Defense Fund, 1988). As a result of this trend, the percentage of families headed by women grew from about 21 percent to 31 percent between 1970 and 1988 (Veum, 1992).

Concern about this pattern was--and continues to be--largely focused on the direct connection between unwed motherhood, child poverty and long-term welfare dependency. Children born out of wedlock now constitute the majority of children receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) funds, and it is estimated that over 40 percent of never-married women who enter the AFDC system at age 25 or less with a child less than three years of age will spend 10 years or more on AFDC (Ooms and Owen, 1990). In 1986, 84 percent of children under three years old living in a household headed by a young (under 22) female were below the official poverty line, compared with 36 percent of same-age children living in young two-parent households.

Until a few years ago, most of the policy response to adolescent childbearing focused on the mothers and babies. More than half of the AFDC budget goes to families in which the mother was a teenager when her first child was born (Danziger and Nichols-Casebolt, 1987/88). Teenage mothers have been primary targets for federal employment and training programs, and for public assistance job training programs and services, such as the Work Incentive Program (WIN).

Young fathers, on the other hand, have generally been ineligible for federal income support programs, their eligibility for state income assistance programs has been restricted, and few public programs have been designed specifically to involve them. However, the 1988 Family Support Act reflects growing public policy interest in the fathers of children on welfare. The Act requires the welfare system to toughen child support enforcement for fathers, including those whose children are not on welfare. In an effort to increase child support collections, the Act set federal performance standards for paternity establishment and increased federal reimbursements to states for the cost of paternity testing--both actions that could make young unwed fathers more attractive targets for these agencies.

Only 19.7 percent of never-married mothers had court orders of child support in 1988, compared with 74 percent of mothers who had been married (Bureau of the Census, Child Support and Alimony, 1990). Furthermore, never-married teen mothers are among the groups least likely to receive child support even if they do have an award. Approximately one in 10 of these mothers receive the support due them, though some studies found that many unwed fathers informally provide cash and in-kind services that are unrecognized in these official statistics (Kastner et al., 1987).

The Child Support Enforcement Program (CSE) was established in 1974 to collect child support payments from the noncustodial parents of children receiving AFDC. However, in 1987, only 3.7 million of the 9.4 million custodial mothers with children under the age of 21 received child support payments from an absent father (Veum, 1992). The Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 and the 1988 Family Support Act have broadened CSE's scope to include all noncustodial parents and encouraged states to be more aggressive in pursuing paternity establishment, securing child support orders and collecting child support payments.

The Family Support Act also provides for selected states to be granted waivers to provide employment and training services to noncustodial parents through the federal Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program, which funds welfare-to-work initiatives for custodial parents on AFDC. This provision led to the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration, which is currently being conducted in nine states by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC). This demonstration also addresses the various public systems' approaches to absent parents, primarily targeting men who are older than those in the P/PV project.

YOUNG FATHERS: CURRENT KNOWLEDGE AND SERVICES

Just who are the fathers of children born to teenage mothers? Are they a subset of young men distinguishable from others who may also be poor and have inadequate employment and access to opportunity? Are their circumstances different enough from those of older unwed fathers to justify different treatment by public agencies? Given the low number who reportedly make official child support payments, what are their attitudes toward fatherhood and their relationships with their children? What is their capacity to support their children? Finally, what barriers to being responsible fathers and providers do they face, and what, if any, services are available to assist them?

Attempts to answer these questions from existing data indicate just how little is known about this population. Little research has been conducted on young unwed fathers--or, indeed, on young men from low-income groups in general. Still, our decisions on how to proceed with this project were greatly influenced by three key findings from the few studies that have been conducted.

First, data from a study based on the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Behavior of Youth indicate that young men who are African American, have educational deficiencies and are from low-income family backgrounds are disproportionately represented among those who become fathers at an early age (Lerman, 1988). This is a significant finding, particularly since there is little other information available about the characteristics of this population.

Second, work by William Julius Wilson (1987), the Children's Defense Fund (1989), Ronald Mincy at the Urban Institute (1989), and Andrew Sum and Neal Fog (1989) points to the relationship between growing joblessness and decreasing earnings among young African-American men, and the increase in black single mothers and female-headed households.

The Children's Defense Fund reports that between 1973 and 1986, the average inflation-adjusted earnings of black males between the ages of 20 and 24 fell by more than 50 percent because of structural changes in the economy, including a loss of jobs in the manufacturing sector that has reduced job opportunities and wages for youth with limited schooling. Wilson's work argues that increasing joblessness among black men--and other trends related to incarceration and mortality--has reduced the pool of "marriageable" men for black women and therefore increased the incidence of single-parent families.[1]

Finally, ethnographic studies suggest that many poor young fathers would like to be more involved with their families. Mercer Sullivan's work among 24 poor young fathers in New York City paints a very different picture of the population than the prevailing stereotype of the young unwed father as an "irresponsible cad." His paper Ethnographic Research on Young Fathers and Parenting: Implications for Public Policy (1986) indicates that many of these young men started out wanting to be good fathers and used various strategies--sometimes illegal or "off the books"--in an effort to support their children. He further argues that their failure to be consistent long-term providers is due more to immaturity and poor preparation for employment than to a cavalier attitude toward fatherhood.

As part of our preliminary investigation, we thoroughly reviewed the few programmatic efforts to provide services directly to unwed and noncustodial fathers that had been developed over the years by community-based organizations and, more recently, by

---

[1] Wilson's hypothesis that the rise in never-married parenthood among blacks is directly related to increasing male joblessness is supported by other historical and demographic research. Historically, out-of-wedlock births become more common during periods of economic downturn. (See Cissie Fairchild, "Female Sexual Attitudes and the Rise of Illegitimacy." Journal of Social History, 1978; and Louise A. Tilly and Joan W. Scott, Women Work and Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978.) Demographers also report that unfavorable economic conditions lead to marital delay and that high unemployment and low wages are associated at the aggregate level with the high incidence of single-parent families. (For an overview of such studies, see Frank R. Furstenberg, Jr., Unplanned Parenthood: The Social Consequences of Teenage Childbearing. New York: Free Press, 1976.)

certain state and local governments. We found a number of community-based efforts that focused on the social and cultural needs of young fathers through counseling and group support sessions. However, because they lacked ties to major public programs like those funded by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), they were rarely able to deal with the training and employment needs of the young men.[2]

We also found a few isolated programs operated through state and county child support enforcement and welfare offices, which offer fathers who owe child support "opportunities" to participate in education and employment services in order to improve their ability to pay. The level and quality of these government programs varied widely. In some cases, programs consisted only of job-search services; in most, the social and parenting development needs of the fathers were unmet because the program's primary objective was to quickly raise state revenues by increasing child support collections.[3]

Next, we looked at the JTPA system's response to this population. While the system does not disaggregate data on youth participants who are fathers, characteristics of the young men served by JTPA match those of young men most likely to be unwed fathers--low-income high school dropouts with little work experience. Thus, they likely form a significant proportion of young minority male enrollees for whom JTPA data are available.

According to a 1990 U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) assessment of JTPA activity, out-of-school youth receiving occupational skills training (including classroom and on-the-job training) experience better placement and wages than those receiving non-occupational training. Nevertheless, black males in the GAO study were less likely than other participants of similar skill and education levels to be placed in occupational skills training for moderate- to high-skilled jobs, and more likely to receive job-search and/or work experience services only. The GAO data show that they were also more likely to be placed in jobs that paid lower wages than their peers.[4]

---

[2] Community-based projects, such as the eight Teen Fathers Collaborative projects initiated through Bank Street College in 1983 and the more recent Adolescent Male Responsibility projects sponsored by the Urban League, have pioneered efforts to develop the psychological and personal aspects of young fathers' lives as well as their education and employment potential. However, these projects have had very limited resources with which to work in the critical areas of training and employment.

[3] Among programs run through child support or welfare offices are those located in Marion County, Indiana; Harford and Prince George's Counties, Maryland; Kent County, Michigan; and Leon, Duvall and Hillsborough Counties, Florida. (The Kent County and Duvall County programs are part of the Parents' Fair Share demonstration.)

[4] According to the 1990 GAO report, starting wages for black males leaving the JTPA system averaged $4.24 per hour and about 24 percent got moderate- or high-skilled jobs. For other male participants, wages averaged $4.57 and the placement rate in moderate- to high-skilled jobs was 34 percent.

In addition, JTPA data gathered between 1987 and 1990 show that the participation of minority males overall in Title II-A lagged well behind that of other groups. The same patterns exist, though less dramatically, among youth participants and other targeted groups--e.g., school dropouts, offenders and those with reading levels below the seventh grade--that include disproportionate numbers of minority males and young fathers. One reason for this lag, speculative at this point, may be that the characteristics and life circumstances of minority males make them difficult for the JTPA system to serve: given the system's emphasis on short-term, low-cost services and performance-based contracting, many Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) have not even tried to serve these youth (Westat, 1991).[5]

There is also evidence--mainly anecdotal evidence based on conversations with experienced operators--that young minority men find the JTPA system as "unattractive" as it finds them. The limited availability of stipends or other significant means of support during training is often mentioned as a key factor. Also mentioned is the attraction of the underground economy, especially when compared with the disappointing jobs and wages that often result for young minority men who do enroll in JTPA.

Finally, a very recent, definitive study of JTPA conducted by Abt Associates (1992) for the Department of Labor indicates that "access to JTPA had no significant effect on the employment rates of either female or male youth" and that "the program actually reduced the earnings of male youth" by a statistically significant 8 percent over 18 months, a reduction primarily attributable to a decrease in hours worked. The report, in which JTPA youth were compared with a control group not enrolled in JTPA programs, also indicates that negative effects were particularly apparent for young men with limited education or little recent work experience, and that "the more barriers faced, the more JTPA reduced future earnings." These are exactly the characteristics of the young men enrolling in P/PV's Young Unwed Fathers Project (see Chapter III).

THE PILOT PROJECT

Development of the pilot project involved consideration of all the issues just reviewed: 1) the policy response to rising teenage out-of-wedlock births in the form of pressure for increased child support collections (i.e., the Family Support Act); 2) the data indicating that low-income young fathers in particular would likely not be economically able to

---

[5] Among the target groups that JTPA is charged with serving--including youth, school dropouts and others characterized as having barriers to employment, such as those with low reading skills, the handicapped, veterans and displaced homemakers--only welfare recipients have been recruited and enrolled successfully, representing approximately 40 percent of JTPA participants over the past three years. Welfare recipients' income and support services lower JTPA expenditures and help SDAs meet cost goals; and the availability of these resources during training makes welfare clients much more likely than other target groups to complete their training and be placed in jobs, thus benefitting JTPA performance standards. Also, the decision of most SDAs not to pay adequate training stipends to participants--since stipends would have to come out of the restricted support services funding category--makes welfare clients particularly attractive.

respond to this pressure; 3) the lack of any substantial program or policy focus on the specific needs of young fathers and, as a result, the lack of reliable information about this population; 4) indications that the public employment/training system is finding it difficult to serve young males; and 5) the indications from ethnographic work that at least some young fathers are interested in becoming good parents and might therefore respond to efforts aimed at helping them do so.

We further considered that, based on data from the National Longitudinal Survey, the fathers of children of unwed teen mothers are, on average, two to four years older than the mothers and thus are often not teens themselves. Therefore, we identified the target group for this project as young fathers between the ages of 16 and 25.

Given the limited programmatic experience with young fathers, the limited knowledge about the type of services that would attract and benefit this population, and their emerging importance as a social policy issue, P/PV determined that a test of various local service delivery approaches was needed to provide comparative information for policymakers and the field. Therefore, participating sites were given flexibility in implementing the following five elements:

1. Use of the JTPA system to provide young fathers with training services that would lead to good jobs. We defined good jobs as those providing standard fringe benefits and the potential to enable the fathers to support themselves and provide support for their children. Although for the most part, JTPA-funded programs have, to date, neither targeted, served, nor produced good results for young minority males, they are virtually the only publicly funded employment training programs available. When the Young Unwed Fathers Project was designed in early 1989, we felt that special efforts should be made to encourage the JTPA system to target these young men, and that additional necessary services should be provided by the Young Fathers Project sites themselves.

2. The delivery of education services designed to improve the earning capacity of young fathers. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, more than half of the new jobs created between 1984 and the year 2000 will require education through and even beyond high school.

3. The delivery of "fatherhood development" activities designed to encourage parental values, capabilities and behavior in young men. Based on the few available studies of this population, including the work of Mercer Sullivan cited earlier, it is clear that many young fathers need assistance and support in making the transition to responsible parenthood and adulthood. Few employment and training programs provide such services, and due to the limited field experience with programs for fathers, few existing materials address this need. P/PV's Fatherhood Development Curriculum, developed in conjunction with outside experts and designed to cover issues related to parenting, fatherhood values and personal growth, is the founda-

tion of fatherhood development activity in this project. In addition, we have encouraged the use of local resources and creativity to involve fathers in other development activity that includes their children and encourages "leadership." Finally, sites are required to work with participants to establish legal paternity and make arrangements to pay formal child support for their children.

4. The provision of counseling and other ongoing support designed to help fathers achieve employment, parenting and personal goals. Like other high-risk youth, unwed fathers are likely to require multiple services that address specific needs. Results of studies conducted under the Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) of 1977 show that programs that combined employment and training services with strong counseling and other support services increased the chances of high-risk youth obtaining stable employment.

5. The establishment of a long-term "connection" with fathers so that services and support continue after job placement and/or throughout the length of the project. Programmatic experience indicates--and research confirms--that overcoming long-term deficits is not an overnight process; programs that have the most success with high-risk populations, such as Job Corps, work with participants over a substantial period of time. Therefore, project sites attempt to make programmatic connections with youth that last at least 18 months.

The Project Sites

In selecting sites for this project, P/PV sought local agencies that showed both an interest in and the ability to implement a program incorporating these five elements in serving young unwed fathers. We also sought geographic diversity. Each site understood that it was to enroll and provide service to at least 50 young fathers for at least 18 months. Since our reconnaissance of the field had disclosed no one delivery strategy that showed particular promise, we considered sites with diversity of organizational type and structure, and approach to recruitment and service delivery.

The project's six sites comprise two community-based organizations (CBOs) that offer the majority of services on site: Cleveland Works in Cleveland, Ohio, and Goodwill Industries in Racine, Wisconsin; two JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) whose contractors deliver most of the services: the Fresno, California, PIC and the Pinellas County PIC in St. Petersburg, Florida; and two community managing agents, or "brokers," who deliver the fatherhood curriculum and refer enrollees to established programs for service: the Philadelphia Children's Network in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Friends of the Family in Baltimore, Maryland.

In keeping with our desire to test local systems' response to serving young fathers, P/PV provided a small seed grant of $55,000 to each site: $50,000 to support project opera-

tions and $5,000 to stimulate local innovations in fatherhood development activity to supplement the parenting curriculum sessions.

Cleveland Works established the "Beat the Streets" program for this project. The agency has been providing a wide variety of employment, training and support services to AFDC participants and their children for more than five years. "Beat the Streets" is the one pilot site that targets and serves non-fathers as well as fathers. For the most part, participation is voluntary, though some young men are referred by the juvenile court. Service delivery is highly structured and most services are offered in-house. Cleveland Works' strength is its solid relationship with the employer community and its tradition of legal support and advocacy for clients.

Goodwill Industries of Racine, Wisconsin, is also a "full-service" CBO, with a history of successfully training another high-risk population--the disabled--to be productive workers. Goodwill's "Young Fathers Program" builds on an established employment and training program for noncustodial fathers of all ages, which Goodwill operates in conjunction with the local child support enforcement agency. Therefore, the participation of a significant number of the young men in the "Young Fathers Program" is mandated by the child support system; the remainder are referred from other Goodwill programs and other agencies. Most training and employment services are provided on site, some under contract with the local community college.

The Fresno Private Industry Council (FPIC) contracts with its largest youth service provider, the Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission (FCEOC) to operate the "Parenting Opportunities Program" (POP). The PIC emphasizes recruitment of fathers who have already established legal paternity of their children and come into the program voluntarily. It works closely with the child support system and other agencies to identify these fathers. All job-readiness training and all support services are provided by the FCEOC, while education and skills training are subcontracted to several outside entities. POP's funding comes from the SDA's youth category, to which 40 percent of its funds are devoted. Therefore, the Fresno project's age range for service was originally 16 to 21; however, the upper age limit was later raised to 25 to facilitate recruitment.

The Pinellas County Private Industry Council, which operates the "JumpStart" program out of the PIC's St. Petersburg office, accepts fathers referred by the Child Support System, as well as other sources. The PIC provides assessments, job-readiness services and in-house job development and placement assistance, and subcontracts with proprietary providers for skills training.

The two "service brokers" participating in the project are new to the employment and training world:

The Philadelphia Children's Network is a recently established nonprofit whose goal is to improve the city's delivery of social services to children and their families. Its "Respon-

sive Fathers Project" (RFP) is the organization's first operational venture. RFP targets one Philadelphia neighborhood, West Philadelphia, and the young men who participate come to the program through a variety of sources. RFP is the one pilot site that has a program track especially for in-school fathers, who make up one-third of the project's participants. For the most part, services are provided through referrals to outside agencies.

The "Young Fathers Program" in Annapolis, Maryland, is a collaboration between Friends of the Family, a statewide family support organization, and the Anne Arundel County Department of Social Services. For the most part, the young men who participate are recruited by project staff from the housing projects and streets of Annapolis's small African-American community. Anne Arundel Community College provides literacy services and GED preparation at a learning center on the project site. The Anne Arundel County Office of Manpower provides access to JTPA-funded skills training and job-readiness, life skills and job-search services.

RESEARCH AGENDA

The research addresses many of the questions raised by our initial investigation. Its mission is to add to the limited body of knowledge about young fathers--their problems, strengths and potential for benefitting from program interventions--and to identify strategies that are especially effective. The research includes three types of studies: an implementation study, an outcomes study and an ethnographic study.

The implementation study, of which this report is the initial component, is concerned with issues of program start-up and ongoing operation. The aim is to describe the actual implementation of the service delivery strategies at each site, to estimate what it would cost to replicate them, and to assess the conditions that either facilitate or constrain effective implementation. Special attention will be given to the effectiveness of strategies employed to recruit, enroll and retain young fathers and to establish and maintain cooperative working relationships among agencies (e.g., community-based organizations, employment and training agencies, and child support enforcement offices). Another objective is to document the characteristics and program experiences of participants in the pilot.

The outcomes study will measure the achievements of the young fathers to determine the effect participation had on their educational attainments, employment and parenting behavior. The study will examine the extent to which young fathers with particular characteristics (e.g., age, age of child, court-mandated or voluntary enrollment) benefit more than others.

Finally, the ethnographic study will provide in-depth information about the motivations, behaviors and life circumstances of young fathers, and the correlation between their needs and aspirations and the services these programs offer. It will also supplement and

enrich the other studies. This study employs on-site researchers at three of the six sites--Racine, Philadelphia and St. Petersburg.

The results of these three pilot studies will be included in the final report, to be issued in Fall 1993, and will be used to determine whether a larger demonstration is warranted, and the feasibility of conducting an impact study.

The interim report presented here covers implementation of the pilot during its first year--through February 1992. Although the report does not provide definitive answers or make final recommendations regarding many of the implementation questions we are exploring, it does shed new light on how we can meet the challenge of recruiting young, unwed, mostly minority fathers (Chapter II); on the young men themselves--the multiple barriers they face as they try to achieve productive employment, and their efforts to assume greater responsibility for their children (Chapter III); on the variety of possible organizational and service delivery strategies, most of which require cooperation by agencies with very different and potentially conflicting missions and outlooks (Chapter IV); and on early indications from the Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project about the impact of current laws and regulations on these young men, and ways to improve the life chances of this important population (Chapter V).

II. RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT: CAN PROJECTS ATTRACT YOUNG FATHERS?

Two major issues to be explored in the Young Unwed Fathers Project are, first, whether young fathers and organizations in contact with them will find the program attractive and, second, what level of effort is necessary to enroll young fathers in the local projects.

During project planning, we found that the recruitment experience of the few existing young fathers programs on these issues gave little cause for optimism. Further, since the Young Fathers Project requires that paternity be legally acknowledged--with all the attendant legal consequences--we were very concerned that young fathers might not be willing to participate. If so, there would be too few enrollees for significant measures of program effectiveness.

Because of funding restrictions, the local programs are small--their goal is to serve 50 fathers during the pilot period. Also, we have no reliable estimates of the total number of eligibles in each project's area of operation. These two factors make it impossible to discuss overall participation or penetration rates based on the sites' experience.

What we did learn in the early operating experience is mixed--both hopeful and sobering. While young fathers did enroll and referral agencies did refer--in increasing numbers as the programs became better known--it is also clear that enrollment was retarded by requirements for establishing legal paternity and eligibility for JTPA services, and the limited availability of stipends during training. Some young men seemed to be drawn to the program because of its emphasis on fathering, though jobs remained the dominant incentive for program entrance.

As of May 1992, enrollment goals were met in four of the six sites. The program effort and resources required to attract even these modest numbers were initially significant and daunting, though they seemed to lessen over time. But even increasing success did not provide strong evidence that enrollment would ever be a low-cost function or that large numbers would easily come forward. There are indications, however, that the recruitment of young fathers is facilitated when the agency or its staff has already established "credibility" with the population; and/or the agency's ability to generate good jobs is well known; and/or its collaboration with the CSE and employment training (JTPA) agencies has been lengthy and proven mutually useful. Few of the Young Fathers Project sites had that reputation or collaboration experience in the early going.

Tables 1 and 2 show the enrollment per site as of February 1992, and how enrollment built up over time. The project is aiming for a total of 300 participants in the 18-month treatment, and progress toward meeting that goal has been slower than expected. By the end of May 1992, there had been 316 enrollments. Four of the projects had achieved

Table 1

ENROLLMENT HISTORY THROUGH FEBRUARY 1992

Site	Enrolled	Terminated/ Reenrolled	Terminated/ Never Reenrolled	Active
St. Petersburg	22	3	6	16
Cleveland	38	1	11	27
Annapolis	24	1	1	23
Fresno	39	1	0	39
Racine	48	0	13	35
Philadelphia	57	6	14	43
All Sites	228	12	45	183

Table 2

ENROLLMENT BUILD-UP THROUGH FEBRUARY 1992

Site	Recruitment Start Date	3/91 - 5/91	6/91 - 8/91	9/91 - 11/91	12/91 - 2/92	Total
St. Petersburg	4/91	4	8	7	2	21
Cleveland	2/91	21	4	8	4	37
Annapolis	3/91	8	7	7	2	24
Fresno	3/91	1	5	15	18	39
Racine	3/91	33	10	2	3	48
Philadelphia	5/91	10	18	12	17	57
All Sites		77	52	51	46	226

Note: Two fathers--one in St. Petersburg and one in Cleveland--have missing enrollment dates.

full enrollment: Fresno, 50; Philadelphia, 63; Racine, 66; and Annapolis, 51. Cleveland had enrolled 44, and St. Petersburg 42.[6]

With the lack of similar programs against which to make comparisons, the sites' recruitment and enrollment efforts must be judged in terms of the goals of the pilot project and the sites' own plans and strategies. Even so, the sites' early experiences provide valuable information about the enrollment issue. The following sections describe the sites' experiences with the major recruitment strategies they employed (and adjusted during the course of the first year).

THE SITES' RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

In their original proposals, the six program operators described their intention to pursue a wide range of recruitment strategies, including taking both mandatory and voluntary referrals from the CSE system; recruiting from other social service programs, such as those that served young mothers; using program staff and participating fathers to do "street work;" using the media to advertise programs; recruiting in hospital maternity wards, schools and churches; and using current and former clients to "get the word out" to their sons, grandsons, brothers and friends. In practice, most of the sites adjusted their strategies in response to the slow pace of enrollment over the first year.

Table 3 shows the sites' recruitment strategies and the responses from enrolled fathers in each site to the question "How did you learn about the program?" These responses tell us which strategies yielded the largest number of fathers. Projectwide, nearly half (46.3%) of the enrollees were referred to the sites by other institutions: 26.9 percent by their local child support office; another 9.3 percent by other agencies, juvenile court or a probation officer; and another 10.1 percent by a teacher, counselor or social worker. Close to one-quarter (22.5%) of the fathers cited personal contacts as the source of information--either another father (10.6%), or a friend or relative (11.9%). Program staff and flyers also played an important role in attracting fathers (22%). Less significant across the six sites was the role of the media; only 7 percent said they heard about the project from newspapers or television. Very few fathers (2.2%) said they learned about the project from their girlfriends.

As shown in Table 4, the response given most frequently to the question "What are the main reasons you have for joining the young fathers program?" was "To get a good job"--given by 62.7 percent of the participants. This underscores the major objective of the project and how it was primarily sold in the sites.

---

[6] Enrollment numbers through May that include only fathers with consent forms are: Annapolis, 40; Cleveland, 44; Fresno, 46; Philadelphia, 63; Racine, 53; and St. Petersburg, 41.

Table 3

HOW ENROLLEES FIRST HEARD ABOUT PROGRAM

	ST. PETERSBURG (n=22)	CLEVELAND (n=38)	ANNAPOLIS (n=24)	FRESNO (n=39)	RACINE (n=48)	PHILADELPHIA (n=57)	ALL SITES (n=228)
Recruitment Strategies	CSE referrals; community outreach (agencies)	Media; participants in other in-house programs; juvenile court	Community outreach; CSE	CSE; other in-house programs; community outreach	CSE; other Goodwill programs	Community outreach	
CSE Referral [a]	36.4%	10.5%[c]	8.7%	35.9%	64.6%	3.5%	26.9%
Media	4.5	28.9	0.0	10.3	0.0	0.0	7.0
School Teacher/ Counselor	4.6	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.1	35.1	10.1
Other Institutional[b]	9.1	13.2	4.4	5.1	0.0	19.3	9.3
Other Participant	13.6	7.9	17.4	18.0	10.4	3.5	10.6
Relative	4.6	18.4	0.0	5.1	2.1	1.8	5.3
Friend	0.0	5.3	4.4	5.1	4.2	14.0	6.6
Girlfriend	9.1	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	2.2
Program Staff	18.2	10.5	60.9	15.4	14.6	1.8	17.6
Program Flyer	0.0	0.0	4.4	2.6	2.1	12.3	4.4

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

[a] CSE refers to Child Support Enforcement Agency.

[b] Other includes juvenile court, probation officer and other programs.

[c] The response category was actually "Worker at the Court" or "Child Support Agency;" in Cleveland this may include referrals from juvenile court.

Table 4

FATHERS' REASONS FOR ENROLLING

	ST. PETERSBURG (n=22)	CLEVELAND (n=38)	ANNAPOLIS (n=24)	FRESNO (n=39)	RACINE (n=48)	PHILADELPHIA (n=57)	ALL SITES (n=228)
Jobs	40.9%	89.5%	83.3%	64.1%	50.0%	54.4%	62.7%
Education Skills	0.0	15.8	54.2	2.6	10.4	14.0	14.5
GED	13.6	31.6	41.7	28.2	35.4	24.6	29.4
Improve Relationship with Children	40.9	10.5	29.2	17.9	66.7	49.1	38.2
Improve Parenting Skills	68.2	13.2	29.2	5.1	62.5	78.9	45.6
Friend(s) In Program	0.0	0.0	16.7	2.6	0.0	1.8	2.6
Make Friends	9.1	0.0	20.8	10.3	2.1	5.3	6.6
Other	13.6	5.3	0.0	20.5	4.6	5.3	7.9

NOTE: Percentages do not total 100 due to multiple responses.

Fathers also responded to the "fatherhood" focus. A substantial percentage said that they joined to improve their parenting skills (45.6%) and their relationships with their children (38.2%).

We can only speculate about the reasons for the wide site-to-site variation in response to the project's fatherhood focus. For example, the low proportion of fathers in Fresno who said they joined to "improve relationships with their children" (17.9%) or "improve parenting skills" (5.1%) may be due to the comparatively large number of fathers in the Fresno site who live in the same household as their children (44%) and who do not feel the need to "improve." (Fathers' living arrangements are discussed in detail in Chapter III.) In the other sites, fathers' responses to the fatherhood focus may reflect what site staff emphasized in "selling" the project. In Cleveland, the relatively few fathers who joined to improve their relationships (10.5%) and their parenting skills (13.2%) could well be due to the Cleveland site's clear definition of Beat the Streets as a "jobs" program. Philadelphia, on the other hand, emphasized improved parenting among its goals, and the high proportion of its fathers citing "improved parenting skills" (78.9%) reflects this emphasis.

Each site utilized one of the following three recruitment sources at the outset: mandatory referrals from the CSE agency (Racine), voluntary referrals from the CSE agency (Fresno and St. Petersburg), and community outreach (Cleveland, Philadelphia and Annapolis). Eventually, sites employed a wider range of varied recruitment strategies, but all their recruitment messages emphasized the job component.

Fresno is the only site to offer a substantial stipend during training (up to $90 a week); Cleveland pays $6 a day and Racine a $15-a-week education incentive. Philadelphia is the only site to recruit in-school youth.

The following sections describe the sites' experience with each strategy.

Referrals from Child Support

Projectwide, half of all the young men referred to sites by other institutions came from CSE agencies, and one-quarter of the CSE referrals enrolled.

In all sites except Racine, which receives mandatory referrals, project staff cited difficulties with the CSE system as the reason for having so few of its referrals convert into enrollments. Even in Racine, however, only 42 percent of CSE referrals enrolled--the other referrals apparently got jobs on their own to fulfill court mandates. In other sites, staff reported that most CSE referrals were "just names"--young men who could not be contacted, never showed up to be interviewed, or were referred without regard to age or other criteria and were quickly determined ineligible.

Other staff attributed the low enrollment rate of referrals to administrative complications, particularly those related to JTPA eligibility: the paperwork takes a long time to

complete; applicants must produce detailed documentation of date of birth, place of residence, household income, etc.; income eligibility is based on household rather than individual income, disqualifying some young men who live with their families; fathers who have worked earlier in the year and earned a certain dollar amount may be ruled ineligible; those working at the time of entry to the young fathers program, even if in an unskilled, low-paid job, do not qualify for JTPA services; and the strict criteria regarding reading level disqualifies those who score too high or too low on eligibility assessment tests.

Mandatory Referrals

The Racine program is the only pilot site that receives mandatory referrals--i.e., the judge orders the young fathers to get a job on their own or enroll in the program as a means of meeting their child support obligations. Of the 89 referrals from CSE, 35 enrolled in Racine's Young Fathers Program. Half the CSE agency-referred enrollees across the project (71) are in the Racine program.

The success of Racine's recruitment effort (48 enrolled by February 1992) is not, however, founded entirely on the mandatory nature of the referrals. Equally important is the solid relationship that Goodwill Industries, the program operator, has with the CSE agency. Since 1990, Goodwill has operated a project for noncustodial parents under contract with the County Human Services Department and in conjunction with the CSE agency. As an alternative to jail, Goodwill provides work experience and job placement to fathers of all ages who are mandated to participate by CSE agencies because of unpaid child support obligations.

A written agreement between Goodwill and the CSE agency allows mandated referrals of young men between the ages of 16 and 25 to the Young Fathers Program, where they receive not only employment-related services, but the additional services and fatherhood development activities called for in the P/PV project. The agency identifies candidates and refers them to the noncustodial parents counselor at Goodwill--a position funded by the Human Services Department/Child Support Agency and charged with placing age-appropriate referrals into the Young Fathers Project.

While two-thirds of Racine participants were mandatory referrals, half said they joined to get good jobs, and large percentages responded that they joined to improve their parenting skills (63 percent) and improve their relationship with their children (67 percent).

Voluntary Referrals

Other sites that receive CSE agency referrals enroll the young men on a voluntary basis. Nearly half (45%) of St. Petersburg's enrollees were referred by the CSE agency; 41 percent in Fresno and 21 percent in Annapolis.

St. Petersburg had originally intended to seek mandated referrals from CSE, and Fresno had also proposed to recruit almost exclusively from CSE referrals, though on a voluntary basis. However, neither site had the benefit of an already tested, well-defined relationship with CSE. Both required prior establishment of paternity and placed a number of other restrictions on eligibility. As a result, their recruitment experience was quite different from that of Racine. By February, only about one-third of their enrollees were referrals from CSE. As a result, St. Petersburg abandoned its plan for mandated referrals and both sites have reduced their reliance on voluntary CSE referrals, turning increasingly to other sources.

Both sites had hoped to recruit unemployed fathers with child support obligations who would "volunteer" to come into the program. They decided to admit only volunteers who had declared paternity prior to program entry since, in light of the project's paternity establishment and child support payment requirements, they did not want to be in the position of "enticing" young men into the program, then "coercing" them into making child support payments. In Fresno, the District Attorney entered "reserve" child support orders, not to be enforced until the father secured employment.

The programs and their referral sources also established other participant eligibility requirements, including eligibility for JTPA; age between 16 and 21; ability to speak English; unemployed status with limited work history; and resident status in the area. These requirements seriously limited the number of referrals that could be made. In Fresno, few fathers in the referring agencies' files were under 21, many were not fluent in English, and a sizable portion lived in rural sections outside the metropolitan area. In St. Petersburg, the CSE had difficulty identifying fathers on its rolls within the project's age range.

In addition, the CSE caseworkers saw their job, and the mission of the agency, as enforcing child support orders, not making referrals to social service programs. And given the average caseload (1,700 cases per worker in Fresno, for example) and the pressure to resolve a certain number of cases daily, workers felt they did not have time to search through cases for appropriate referrals. In St. Petersburg, CSE simply did not have the staff time or other resources to commit the necessary effort.

All these factors continued to hinder the programs' ability to enroll fathers in a timely way. In Fresno, recruitment began in March 1991; three months later, 16 referrals had been received through CSE, 12 had met the program requirements, and only six of the CSE-referred fathers had enrolled. The St. Petersburg program had enrolled only 11 CSE referrals after four months of operation.

Toward the end of the year, both sites adjusted their recruitment strategies to reduce the central role of CSE and conduct more aggressive outreach to other sources. This helped improve the recruitment picture in both sites, but enrollments in St. Petersburg were still

lagging 12 months into the program. (However, enrollment increased sharply to 41 in the following three months.)

Fresno focused its outreach on other programs serving young men and teen mothers. Still concerned about coercing fathers into the child support system, the program dropped the requirement of paternity establishment prior to program entry. While this placed less reliance on referrals from the DA's office, with time and experience recruitment through this source began to pay off. The PIC board also voted to allow 10 percent of the participants enrolled by the youth program operating the project to be over the age of 21, thereby removing a significant impediment to child support referrals. Other action to encourage referrals included broad use of a video--specifically in welfare offices and on television as a public service announcement. By May, enrollment had increased to 50.

In their proposals, Philadelphia, Annapolis and Cleveland all indicated that they would accept referrals from local CSE agencies, but did not view them as key to recruitment. In fact, each of these sites had early meetings with CSE staff, received a few referrals, and did little to resolve the administrative and bureaucratic difficulties that arose. Relatively few enrollments resulted.

Community Outreach

Three of the pilot sites have little relationship with the CSE system, relying instead on broad-based community outreach (Cleveland); on referrals from other organizations serving minority male youth (Philadelphia); and on "street work" by staff (Annapolis). As discussed earlier, Fresno and St. Petersburg decreased their initial reliance on CSE referrals and moved toward community outreach during the first year. While all the sites' recruitment messages emphasize the project's jobs component, Philadelphia and Annapolis--both new to the employment and training field--give equal weight to "advertising" personal development, education and parenting.

Broad-Based Community Outreach by an Established Agency

Cleveland Works' Beat the Streets program was able to enroll close to half of the targeted 50 participants within the first three months of recruitment. It is the only pilot site that serves both fathers and "potential" fathers (200 combined over the life of the project) and relies primarily on the "tried and true" recruitment approaches that worked in attracting Cleveland Works' traditional population--women on AFDC. These approaches include media advertising and public service announcements; outreach to other programs; and referrals obtained from current and former participants. Cleveland got good results from radio and television--close to 30 percent of its participants say they heard about the program that way. About 18 percent were informed by a relative, and 13 percent were informed by a friend or another father.

In addition, the Cleveland site set up a referral mechanism with the Court of Common Pleas' Juvenile Court Division: judges could use the "Beat the Streets" program as an alternative to sentencing. Many of the project's staff, a number of whom are lawyers, had existing relationships with judges that helped put the mechanism in place. Fathers referred by the juvenile court are among the 13 percent of enrollees who responded that they heard about "Beat the Streets" through other institutional sources.

Cleveland Works is a well-established organization with a strong reputation in the community for delivering jobs. Cleveland's fathers responded that they joined "to get a good job" more often (89%) than did fathers in any other site; this response far outdistanced any other, undoubtedly because the Cleveland staff sees job development and placement as their most important mission. In addition, Cleveland Works' executive director is a well-known community activist, and the project staff, as well as the Cleveland Works staff in general, has a large proportion of African-American males. The staff includes former college and professional athletes, who serve as role models for participants.

The Fresno project also began to employ broad-based community outreach when its reliance on voluntary referrals from CSE failed to produce satisfactory enrollments. Once the Fresno PIC recruitment process stopped relying solely on the CSE system and began taking referrals from credible community sources, such as its subcontractor, FCEOC, enrollments quickly increased. FCEOC has an excellent reputation for providing jobs and was able to direct young men who came to the organization for services to the POP program. The fact that participating fathers could earn needs-based payments of up to $90 a week helped FCEOC's sales pitch. (The role of stipends and needs-based payments in retaining fathers is discussed in Chapter IV.) Participants also played a key role in "selling" the program to other fathers.

In January, Fresno completed preparation of a pamphlet and a video designed to encourage young mothers to identify their children's fathers. The materials identified the CBO that would help them get good jobs, and stressed the psychological and Social Security benefits children gain when their fathers establish paternity. This material is displayed in the lobby of the DA's office, in welfare offices, schools, programs for teen mothers and other places frequented by young women. Whether this strategy helps produce additional recruits is not yet known.

The St. Petersburg site has also broadened its outreach beyond CSE, but continues to lag in enrollment. The program operator, the Pinellas County PIC, has funded programs in the community since 1980, including special initiatives for teen parents and minority youth, and the project coordinator, a young African-American man, is well-known in the community. However, the Pinellas PIC does not have the benefit of a strong relationship and identification with a respected community-based organization (like the FCEOC in Fresno) to enhance its own reputation as a job provider, and some CBOs in the area have had concerns about referring young fathers to a program that requires paternity declaration. Thus, few enrollees have been referred by other programs.

Staff Connections with Recruitment Sources

The Philadelphia and Annapolis projects both proposed general community outreach as their main approach to recruitment and chose staff who would provide "strong connections" to community sources.

The Philadelphia "Responsive Fathers Project" had enrolled 21 out-of-school fathers within the first three months of its recruitment effort--more than any other site. Referrals were made by other programs (19 percent); friends, other fathers and relatives of young fathers (19 percent); and the staff's own contacts (9 percent).

The sponsoring organization, the Philadelphia Children's Network, had been in existence only one year in February 1991 and did not have a reputation or well-developed program offerings that could attract young men. However, the head of the Network, the project director and the case manager are all African-American men who are well-respected and connected in the community. The response to the program rested almost entirely on these men's ability to use their reputation, experience and personal contacts to get referrals from organizations and people with solid access to young fathers. When these men said "good jobs" and "support for fathers," the organizations believed them and referred young fathers, even though the Network could offer little tangible evidence of effectiveness.

In addition to enrolling out-of-school fathers, Philadelphia had reserved 15 of its 50 participant slots for in-school fathers from three high schools in the project's target area. Several ranking staff members of the Network are former school district employees and worked with the school district bureaucracy to iron out administrative difficulties, cultivate staff and counselors and, in turn, recruit participants. When the in-school component began operating late in 1991, several fathers were ready to enroll. Over one-third of the Philadelphia enrollees responded that they heard about the program through a counselor or social worker; almost two-thirds of these were referred by their high school counselor.

The Annapolis project has had a different experience. The project has good connections in the community, and benefits from the African-American male staff it has chosen, especially in its relations with the target population. A particularly effective recruiter in Annapolis is a young father who was asked to join the staff specifically for recruiting. The majority of recruits (61 percent) came in as a result of direct staff efforts on the streets.

However, enrollments grew very slowly, reaching 24 by February and 40 by the end of May. Neither Friends of the Family nor the Department of Social Services, the project cosponsors, were familiar with this population prior to the unwed fathers program and

did not provide much assistance.[7] Also, the program has been unable to develop a solid network of services that might attract more young men--especially training and jobs.

Nevertheless, the responses of the young men who have come into the Annapolis program demonstrate the power of a credible voice in working with this population. Based on little more than the encouragement of other young men they could relate to, fathers enrolled to "get a good job" and learn to be better parents.

CONCLUSION

Like most public- and/or private-sector organizations today, all project sites are facing shortages and struggling to make the most effective use of staff and other resources for ongoing recruitment as well as service delivery. However, programs like those in Racine, Cleveland and Fresno, which have established interagency relationships and been able to draw on the resources of their parent organizations to support their efforts, have been better able to handle both these tasks. Racine and Cleveland have both included young fathers in their established, familiar recruitment strategies.

Since the Fresno PIC and its subcontractor, FCEOC, decided to become more involved in the recruitment effort for the POP program, they too have been able to make good use of their existing recruitment systems. On the other hand, the Pinellas PIC, though its financial and administrative resources are strong, did not have the benefit of a strong subcontractor to operate JumpStart.

The Annapolis project particularly has struggled with the resource issue. Although the project is sponsored by the Department of Social Services and Friends of the Family, it receives little day-to-day support from either agency. Annapolis has the smallest budget of all the sites and only one dedicated staff person, who is responsible for recruiting participants as well as coordinating all aspects of service delivery. (See Appendix A for project budgets and staffing.) This lack of resources has hurt both the recruitment effort and--as is discussed later in the report--the organization and delivery of program services. Philadelphia, on the other hand, has strong organizational resources--in staff, funding and administration--which, in recruitment efforts, counteract the lack of a history of services delivered. (See Chapter IV.)

For all the sites, attracting this very hard-to-reach population is just the first step. The second step, which presents another set of challenges, is to organize and deliver services to retain young fathers and positively affect their skills and employment prospects. The lessons learned in this area are explored in Chapter IV. First, however, it seems appropriate to take a closer look at the characteristics of the young fathers who enrolled in the project, in order to put further lessons into context.

---

[7] Friends of the Family had attempted a small effort to attract fathers to services in three of its eight Family Support Centers in Maryland, but with little success.

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE YOUNG UNWED FATHERS WHO ENROLLED IN THE PROJECT SITES

Although young fathers have been receiving increased attention in recent years, there is still relatively little information available about them, particularly when compared with what is known about young mothers. This chapter presents a social and demographic portrait of the young men who have enrolled in the Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project, based on what they say about themselves. This information is consistent with many of the findings of the few existing studies on other young father populations and, like that of the other studies, it is inconsistent with the view that these fathers are "deadbeat dads."

The data presented are from two sources: 1) the intake forms completed by staff for 228 young men who enrolled by the end of February 1992 and signed consent forms for use of the information they provided; and 2) a telephone survey conducted by a P/PV subcontractor, the Social Science Research Center at California State University, Fullerton, of 159 of the 228 enrollees.

BASIC DEMOGRAPHICS AND LIFE CIRCUMSTANCES

Close to three-quarters of the study sample of 228 young fathers are African American; approximately 14 percent are Hispanic, enrolled largely in the Fresno site; and 9 percent are white, most enrolled in St. Petersburg and Racine.

Existing survey data indicate that young men who are African American, have educational deficiencies and come from poor economic circumstances are disproportionately represented among those who become fathers at an early age.[8] Other studies, cited in Chapter I, indicate further that poor education and sparse employment experience are formidable barriers to achieving self-sufficiency and further alienate young people from the systems and services available to assist them out of poverty. The participants in the Young Fathers Project mirror these characteristics. (See Table 5 for participants' key demographic characteristics at intake.)

Across all six sites, the young men live in households that are very poor. More than half (52.8%) report that they live in households with annual incomes below $10,000; the average household size is four; 61.5 percent of the households are on welfare; half receive food stamps. The men and the mothers of their children appear to be about the

---

[8] The most comprehensive and reliable source of information about this population is the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Behavior of Youth, first conducted in 1979 using a national sample of 12,686 individuals (with oversampling of African Americans, Latinos and economically disadvantaged whites) who were between the ages of 14 and 21, with follow-up interviews every year through 1987. See Lerman (1988) for a full description.

Table 5

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

	ST. PETERSBURG (n=22)	CLEVELAND (n=38)	ANNAPOLIS (n=24)	FRESNO (n=39)	RACINE (n=48)	PHILADELPHIA (n=57)	ALL SITES (n=228)
AGE (mean)	21.9	21.7	21.8	20.1	19.7	21.2	20.9
RACE							
Black (n=167)	63.6%	94.7%	100.0%	12.8%	72.9%	93.0%	73.3%
Hispanic (n=31)	0	0	0	71.8	6.3	0	13.6
White (n=21)	31.8	2.6	0	7.7	20.8	0	9.2
Other (n=9)	4.6	2.6	0	7.7	0	7.0	4.0
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS[a]							
With Own Parents	68.2%	42.1%	66.7%	59.0%	48.0%	57.9%	55.3%
With Own Parents and Other Family	54.6	39.5	75.0	48.7	52.1	57.9	53.5
With Own Parents and Child	4.6	2.6	16.7	2.6	0	7.0	4.8
With Girlfriend and Child	0	21.1	12.5	38.5	25.0	26.3	23.3
With Girlfriend's Family	0	2.6	33.3	2.6	8.3	15.8	10.1
With Unrelated Adults (over 21)	22.7	15.8	33.3	12.8	29.2	21.1	21.9
With Unrelated Youth (under 21)	36.4	18.4	45.8	7.7	37.5	22.8	26.3
HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION							
Household Size	5.1	3.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.3
On Welfare	59.1%	73.7%	45.8%	74.4%	43.8%	67.3%*	61.5%
Receiving Food Stamps	54.6	63.2	41.7	66.7	39.6	43.6*	50.9
Receiving AFDC	27.3	26.3	25.0	59.0	37.5	30.9*	35.4
EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT							
HS Diploma	4.6%	34.2%	33.3%	18.0%	21.9%	24.6%	23.7%
GED	27.3	7.9	4.4	10.3	12.5	8.8	11.0
Job Training	9.1	21.1	16.7	20.5	4.2	22.8	16.2
Employed at Entry	31.8	10.5	54.2	15.4	20.8	21.1	23.1
INCOME[b]	(n=22)	(n=32)	(n=23)	(n=38)	(n=15)	(n=46)	(n=176)
$0 - 5,000	31.8%	34.4%	21.7%	21.1%	40.0%	28.3%	28.4%
$5,001 - 10,000	22.7	25.0	21.7	34.2	20.0	19.6	24.4
$10,001 - 15,000	18.2	21.9	17.4	23.7	13.3	10.9	17.6
$15,001 - 20,000	18.2	9.4	21.7	5.3	0	21.7	13.6
$20,001 +	9.1	9.3	17.4	15.8	26.7	19.6	15.9

39 40

[a] Percentages may not total 100 due to multiple responses.

[b] Fifty-two fathers either did not respond, or said "don't know" when asked about their household income.

* Two fathers in Philadelphia did not respond to these questions.

same age: the mean age of the 159 young men included in the telephone survey is 21.2; the mean age of their partners is 20.8. At intake, close to 4 percent reported that they were married.[9]

Forty-three percent of the men have less than an 11th-grade education. Twenty-four percent had earned a high school diploma and 11 percent a GED at the time of program entry. Only 4 percent had completed one year of postsecondary education. (It should be noted that 11 percent of the young fathers in the sample were still in high school when they enrolled in the project, 3.5 percent were in GED preparation programs, 6 percent were attending college and 3 percent were in other educational programs.)

Training and Employment History

The young fathers in the sample report very sparse labor market experiences. The large majority (77%) were unemployed on program entry. Those who were employed (23%) were working an average of 27 hours per week and earning an average wage of $5.36 an hour; most reported dissatisfaction with their pay, benefits and opportunities for advancement. Three-fourths of the men, though currently unemployed, had worked at some time during the previous year and expressed the same dissatisfaction as those currently working. Given these data, it is not surprising that such a large percentage of fathers who enrolled (67%) did so to "get a good job."

Eighty-four percent reported that they had not been involved in a training program in the past three years, though 23 percent were in an educational program or still in high school at entry. Fifty-eight percent said they had male family members and friends in their 20s and 30s who were neither in school nor working.

Environmental Factors

In responding to questions about their neighborhoods, crime and drugs, the fathers who participated in the telephone survey provided a context within which to view their lives and the circumstances under which they develop as parents. More than half the fathers reported that crime and drugs are common in their neighborhoods. Sixty-five percent said they had been arrested, with 39 percent having been in jail and 50 percent having been on probation or parole.

These data underscore the oft-discussed involvement of so many young minority men in the criminal justice system. In mid-1989, nearly one of every four black men between 20 and 29 was either in jail, on probation or on parole; and the total of young black men in their 20s supervised by the criminal justice system in 1989 (609,690) was greater than the number attending college in 1986 (436,000) (Mauer, 1990). Program staff indicate that

[9] As a general rule, we asked sites to enroll "unwed" fathers; however, we did not prohibit participation of married fathers who met other program criteria.

fathers' criminal records are significant barriers to employment and that many fathers need legal assistance because of their difficulties with the law.

Seventy-three percent of the fathers in the telephone survey reported that drugs are easy to come by in their neighborhoods. More than one-quarter (29 percent) said they had sold drugs and 21 percent reported getting in "some kind of trouble" because of using drugs or alcohol; 14 percent said they had received drug or alcohol treatment.

Living Arrangements

In the intake sample of 228, 55 percent of the young men reported that they lived in a household with at least one of their parents or other relatives, such as grandparents or brothers and sisters. The fact that 45 percent of older fathers (i.e., 21 to 25 years old) lived with parents and family members is indicative of the fragile economic circumstances and uncertain job market prospects of this population. Twenty-eight percent lived in households with at least one of their children, and 23 percent lived with their girlfriend and child(ren).

Race appears to be a significant and differentiating factor in the living arrangements of young fathers. White fathers were less likely (44%) to live with parents than African-American or Hispanic fathers, who lived with parents at about the same rate (56% and 54%, respectively). The National Longitudinal Survey data for 1984, which report on a sample similar in age--19 to 26--also found that never-married African-American fathers were more likely than never-married white fathers to live with parents--59 percent versus 43 percent. Also in the young fathers sample, more Hispanic fathers (44%) reported living in a household with one or more of their children than did African-American fathers (25%) or white fathers (28%).

RELATIONSHIPS WITH MOTHER AND CHILDREN

No conclusive data are available concerning the number of children fathered by individual young unmarried men, though it is commonly assumed that a good number of these young men are responsible for multiple births. Among the fathers in this sample, however, 63 percent reported having only one child; 82 percent said they had children by only one mother. The data show that African-American fathers were most likely to have more than one child, followed by Hispanic fathers, then white fathers.

The telephone survey also asked for information in relation to other widely held views about young fathers: that they are "absent" from their children's lives or the lives of their children's mother; that they have casual, fleeting relationships with the young mothers and are not attached to their children; and that they do not support them, leaving young mothers to fend for themselves (Robinson, 1988).

Contact with Children and Their Mothers

Table 6 presents what the young men reported about their relationship with their child's mother at the time of survey and at the time of pregnancy.[10] These data should be viewed cautiously. They are based entirely on self-reports, and the degree of selection bias is unknown, i.e., we do not know if young fathers enrolled in the project are more or less likely to be concerned about their families.

Although only 2.6 percent of fathers reported that they were married to the mother of their child at the time she became pregnant, 50.3 percent said they had been in a "serious romance" with the mother and 30.1 percent said this serious relationship was current. In addition, the proportion reporting being married had risen from 4 percent at intake to 10.5 percent at the time of the telephone survey. Only 1.3 percent said they had not been in a relationship with the mother at all at the time of pregnancy, and 2.6 percent reported that they knew the mother of their child "only a little." These responses are similar to those given in other studies by young mothers when asked about their relationships with or knowledge of the fathers of their children.[11]

A large majority of respondents (75%) reported that they visited their child in the hospital when he or she was born; and 85 percent said they were listed as the father on their child's birth certificate. As mentioned earlier, 23 percent indicated that they lived with their child and his/her mother; and 28 percent reported living in the same household as their child.

Additional data were collected on the fathers' involvement with their children and some of their attitudes about fatherhood. Of the fathers who do not live with their children, 38.9 percent responded that they had seen their children "almost every day" in the past month; and over 70 percent said they had seen them at least once a week. (See Table 7.) Sixty-five percent reported that they would like to see their child more often.

Even more revealing of the role that many of these fathers play in the lives of their children are the activities the fathers report. More than 50 percent said they took the child to appointments with doctors; and large percentages reported often bathing (46%), feeding (81%), dressing (73%) and playing with (87%) their child. More than 90 percent of the sample reported that they liked spending time with their child, and that they wanted to be an important part of the child's life. Sixty-one percent said they would be

---

[10] All the data reported here on the children of young fathers refer to the youngest child and the mother of the youngest child.

[11] In a 1983 study (reported in Hardy et al., 1989), which surveyed 363 adolescent mothers in Baltimore, most mothers reported that the father of their child had been known to them for some time. Only 9 percent had known the father for less than six months, and more than half had been acquainted with the father for more than two years.

Table 6

PARTICIPANTS' RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUNGEST CHILD'S MOTHER AT TIME OF PREGNANCY AND AT TIME OF SURVEY

	Time of Pregnancy	At Time of Survey
Married	2.6%	10.5%
Serious Romance	50.3	30.1
On and Off	12.4	12.4
Casual Friends	12.4	*
Knew A Little	2.6	*
No Relationship	1.3	15.0
Child-Centered	*	22.9
Hostile	*	3.9
Other	18.3	5.2

*Not offered as a response category.

Note: Percentages are based on 153 fathers of the 159 who participated in the telephone survey. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Table 7

PARTICIPANTS' FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH YOUNGEST CHILD

Almost Every Day	38.9%
4 to 5 Days A Week	5.6
2 to 3 Days A Week	19.4
Once A Week	6.5
2 to 3 Times A Month	12.0
Once A Month	3.7
Never	13.9

Note: Sample size was 108. Forty-five fathers who reported living with their youngest child are excluded from this table.

upset if another man--particularly the mother's boyfriend--became involved in their child's life.

Financial Support

The fathers were also asked about the kind and amount of financial support they provide for their children. Thirty percent reported having a child support order; the average order reported was $118 a month. Seventy-one percent of these fathers said they were behind in their child support payments.

Eighty-eight percent of the fathers in the telephone survey reported providing monetary support for their children, not including formal child support payments. The fathers reported directly paying for food (74%), toys/books (80%), clothing (84%), diapers (68%) and medicine (42%). The amount fathers reported spending on these items during the past month varied from nothin[illegible] fathers) to $700 (two fathers). The median response was $100.[12] Also, 78 (49[illegible] fathers indicated that they give additional money each month to the mother [illegible] rson caring for their child. The median response to this question was $75. Responses of fathers who reported having a child support order were similar to those of fathers who said they did not.

Given that the majority of fathers were unemployed at the time of the telephone survey, these figures seem high. We spoke with site staff to verify the accuracy of these responses. Staff agreed that it is very unlikely that the fathers spend this much every month, but the consensus was that fathers do spend significant amounts of money when they have it. Staff also pointed out that most of these young men have irregular work histories; the jobs they have held have often been temporary or seasonal, many of them earn money "under the table," and some have sold drugs.[13]

Although these data are all self-reported and should therefore be viewed cautiously, they are significant because they show that fathers, with and without child support orders, indicate a willingness to provide direct support to their children and, in some cases, the mother or other caretaker. However, it seems unlikely that they are able to provide such support on a regular basis. The majority of fathers with formal child support orders admit that they have difficulty keeping up with the payments on a regular basis.

---

[12] The median is the response that when responses are rank-ordered from highest to lowest, 50 percent of responses are below and 50 percent are above. In this instance, the median is a more accurate reflection of the average amount spent, because it corrects for the effect on the mean of the few fathers (seven) who reported spending more than $400. The mean reported was $163. In this case, the median is also the mode--i.e., the most frequent response. Twenty-four fathers reported spending $100.

[13] We also checked to see whether there was any difference in the amount reported according to the father's age, the father's income, and whether the father lives with at least one of his children. There were no differences found for any of these variables.

If the reported figures are even close to accurate, it appears that fathers whose children receive AFDC (49 percent in this sample) and who do not have child support orders may be able to provide a substantial supplement to the AFDC grant, at least on an irregular basis. However, by declaring paternity and taking on formal child support obligations as this project encourages such fathers to do, they become open to legal liability if they fall behind on their payments. They might also reduce the income of the household in which their child lives, because the "pass through" to the household of the total child support payment collected from the father is only $50 a month, with the remainder going to offset AFDC costs. Thus, the children could receive substantially less than what the fathers report providing for their children's care. Whether this affects the willingness of fathers in the project to declare paternity is explored in greater detail in Chapter IV, which deals with program services.

SEXUAL PRACTICES AND FAMILY PLANNING

The few available studies about the sexual practices of young fathers indicate that these men are more likely than their non-father peers to come from environments where early pregnancy is common and to engage in unprotected intercourse (Rivera et al., 1985). The responses from this sample appear to substantiate these findings.

Regarding sexual practices, 65 percent of the young fathers reported that they were engaging in intercourse at least twice a week; less than one-half (42%) reported using birth control every time. Twenty-seven percent reported that they use birth control occasionally or about half the time; and 26 percent said they did not use birth control at all. (Half of these youth did not respond to a subsequent question about why they did not use birth control.) Sixty-eight percent indicated that they had family members and friends who were unwed fathers.

CONCLUSION

It is clear from the data presented that the majority of the young men in this project come from very deprived circumstances and have a multitude of economic and social problems that prevent them from taking on all the responsibilities of fatherhood. At the same time, the data show these young men to be resourceful and resilient, making repeated efforts to provide some level of financial support and be a part of their children's lives. While the sample is small and the self-reports are uncorroborated, the findings are similar to those of other studies of young fathers.

A major question to be addressed by this project is whether the programs involved can capitalize on the interest of these young men and help them to increase their capabilities as parents and providers. Chapter IV explores how each site has attempted to do this, and assesses the experience thus far.

IV. MEETING THE NEEDS OF YOUNG FATHERS: PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND SERVICES

The sites' early operating experience indicates that delivering services to young fathers is challenged particularly by the fact that they need both labor market preparation and immediate income to meet child support responsibilities.

Certain aspects of service delivery presented a challenge to all sites, though early indications are that the most established and experienced operators in the project have done the best overall job of delivering services to young fathers in accordance with the project principles. Even the most experienced program operators, however, have faced formidable obstacles in providing the young men with "good" jobs and/or skills training, retaining them in education programs that may compete with time spent working to discharge their child support obligations (official or otherwise), and encouraging those who have not declared paternity to do so.

This chapter presents data on fathers' participation in program services during the initial implementation phase and discusses the factors that appear to facilitate or hinder the programs' ability to deliver those services. Again, it is important to remember that the data presented here are not conclusive, but represent a summary of the programs' and fathers' experiences approximately one year into a 30-month project. The data referred to in this chapter are for the sample of 228 fathers who had enrolled and signed consent forms by the end of February 1992. Twenty-three fathers in this group enrolled during the month of February (most of them in the Fresno and Philadelphia sites) and thus had participated in very limited program services at the time the sample was drawn.

The main focus of this chapter is on the ability of sites to provide employment-related services. This focus reflects the central importance of these services in helping young fathers increase their capabilities as providers; the desire to evaluate the ability of sites to utilize JTPA funds (the primary federal funding source readily available for young males); and the lack of hard data at this stage of the project on outcomes associated with fatherhood development activity, counseling and other ongoing support, including the attempt to provide a long-term program connection.

TRAINING, EDUCATION AND JOBS

In planning the project, we encouraged sites to make full use of the federally funded employment/training system (JTPA) in designing their service delivery strategies. While there were indications, as mentioned earlier, that the JTPA system had not been successful in attracting young minority men (who make up a disproportionate number of those who become fathers at an early age), it is nevertheless the major public resource for providing employment-related services. The project offered an opportunity to examine

the system's interest in and capacity to provide appropriate services for a group that has rapidly become a public policy priority.

The three longest-established agencies--in Racine, Cleveland and Fresno--have done the best initial job of providing employment-related services to young fathers. This is particularly true for their delivery of education and job-readiness services. Far more fathers were participating in these services in Racine, Cleveland and Fresno than in two of the other three sites. (The one exception--Annapolis, where 67 percent of fathers took part in education services--will be discussed later.)

It can certainly be argued that these sites' ability to deliver services correlates directly with the overall experience and strength of the operating agencies. Each of these operators has a great deal of experience delivering services to hard-to-serve populations--in Racine and Fresno, specifically young men. (In 1991, 50 percent of the participants in Fresno's summer youth program were male and Fresno has also served significant numbers of males in its regular out-of-school youth program. Racine's noncustodial parents program has always served males of all ages.) The fathers programs in these sites also benefit from the overall resources of their parent (operating) agencies, including staff, funds and administrative support, and solid connections with outside service delivery agencies.

It is also clear that for these organizations, access to the JTPA system is key to their service delivery strategies. In both Fresno and Cleveland, JTPA funding supports the majority of project costs; in Racine, approximately one-half. (See site budgets and funding sources in the site descriptions, Appendix A.) This support is critical to the sites' ability to provide employment-related services to fathers. In the three sites, JTPA funds are used to provide these services to all who are eligible: all fathers in Fresno, nearly 80 percent in Cleveland and more than half in Racine.[14]

None of the other three sites--St. Petersburg, Philadelphia and Annapolis--has been successful at packaging and delivering JTPA services for this population. This has resulted in limited service delivery capacity and options, reflected in the much lower percentages of fathers participating in services at these sites. (See Table 8.)

Employment Services in Cleveland, Fresno and Racine

Cleveland, Fresno and Racine are the only sites delivering substantial employment-related services, which they organize around the principles of case management and an emphasis on in-house service delivery. Fathers begin participation with a concentrated set of education and job-readiness services. At Cleveland Works and Racine Goodwill, all services--from assessment to job placement--are provided on site. In Fresno, job-

[14] In Racine, education services are provided by Gateway Technical College, with non-JTPA funds.

Table 8

JTPA-CERTIFICATION AND DATA ON EDUCATION AND JOB-READINESS BY SITE

	ST. PETERSBURG (n=22)	CLEVELAND (n=38)	ANNAPOLIS (n=24)	FRESNO (n=39)	RACINE (n=48)	PHILADELPHIA (n=57)	ALL SITES (n=228)
JTPA-Certified	41%	79%	17%	100%	54%	0%	47%
EDUCATION PARTICIPATION AND ACHIEVEMENTS AS OF FEBRUARY 1992							
Enrolled in education[a]	22.7%	89.5%	66.7%	60.0%[b]	62.5%	38.6%	54.8%
Enrolled in education who completed education	0	17.6	0	38.9	13.3	4.5	14.4
Enrolled in education who obtained GED	0	5.9	0	22.2	33.3	4.5	13.6
Enrolled in education who are still active	20.0	20.6	62.5	5.6	30.0	86.3	37.6
GED or HS diploma at entry	31.8	42.1	37.5	28.2	35.4	33.3[c]	34.6
JOB-READINESS PARTICIPATION AND COMPLETIONS AS OF FEBRUARY 1992							
Participated in preemployment skills	27.3%	86.9%	8.3%	100.0%	41.7%	0%	43.9%
Preemployment skills participants who completed preemployment skills or received a job-readiness certificate	50.0	72.7	100.0	89.7	90.0	0	82.0

[a] The majority of education placements were in basic skills and GED programs, except in Philadelphia, where 17 of the 22 fathers participated in the in-school component.

[b] For the Fresno site, nine fathers who entered in February could not be referred to education services until March. Thus, they are not accounted for in this table.

[c] In Philadelphia, 17 fathers were still in school at program entry and did not have a high school diploma or GED; 47.5 percent of the 40 fathers in the *out-of-school track* entered the program with a high school diploma or GED.

readiness services are offered at the site, but technical skills training and education services are referred out.[15]

The length of the "up-front" program component varies from three to eight weeks across the three sites, but its goals are the same in each: to assess fathers' skills and complete case plans; to introduce fathers to the program and organization; and to provide life skills, job-readiness/motivational curricula and basic skills/GED classes (which continue beyond the up-front component for many participants) before fathers are placed in jobs or off-site training. During this period, services are scheduled at the program site every day in order to build commitment to participation in the program.

The life skills and job-readiness services vary in content and sequencing across the three sites, but all focus on increasing the self-confidence of participants and making them more attractive as potential employees. Specifically, they aim to improve job-search skills, such as resume writing, telephone and interviewing skills; and instill positive work habits, attitudes and behaviors, such as punctuality, regular attendance, proper appearance and good verbal communication.

The ability to use JTPA resources to respond to the fathers' need and desire for employment-related services, and to package and deliver services in the up-front component, appears to be at least partly responsible for these sites' high participation rates, as shown in Table 8. This seems especially true of the job-readiness services, which, because they are on-site, are readily accessible.

JTPA resources have also been used in Fresno, and to a lesser extent in Cleveland and Racine, to provide a level of "in-program" financial support for fathers, another important factor in keeping fathers engaged. In Fresno, the PIC provides a (relatively) substantial stipend of up to $90/week for satisfactory participation (30 hours/week). In Cleveland and Racine, eligible participants get much smaller amounts: in Cleveland, fathers are given $6/day, plus an allowance for training-related necessities; in Racine, fathers who satisfactorily complete specific education modules can earn between $10 and $25 a week.

With a large percentage of employment-related service delivery funded by JTPA, the three sites are also able to be more flexible with other organizational resources, and to use them to provide additional support to their young fathers program, particularly to non-JTPA-eligible fathers.

---

[15] Fresno is the only site with plans to offer technical skills training to any number of participants. However, because recruitment problems and the way the Fresno program is structured led to a slow start-up, no fathers had yet been enrolled in the training as of February.

Employment Services in Annapolis, Philadelphia and St. Petersburg

These three sites have been unable to package and deliver significant JTPA services for young unwed fathers. In Annapolis, the lack of access to JTPA funds is evident, most obviously in the overall lack of financial support for project operations. The Annapolis Young Fathers Project is the most meagerly funded of the sites, with a budget consisting of the P/PV site grant, and a few in-kind services (e.g., space, limited administrative oversight, and the use of county vans for transportation) from the two sponsoring agencies, the Anne Arundel County Department of Social Services and Friends of the Family. The biggest effect of the limited budget is on staffing--the project coordinator is the only full-time staff person. Along with two part-time curriculum deliverers, the coordinator is responsible for all aspects of the program's operations.

This bare-bones operational structure has limited the site's ability to organize and manage the delivery of concrete employment-related services for fathers. Few fathers (17%) have been certified eligible for JTPA services, the only training available. As the data in Table 8 show, enrollment in education services in the Annapolis project is high, due to the presence of an on-site learning center operated by Anne Arundel Community College, but participation rates are low, as will be discussed later.

Philadelphia has faced a very different problem. Its project is well-funded and has good organizational support, but because the Philadelphia Children's Network is a new organization and the Responsive Fathers Project is its only currently operating program, there are few organizational resources and economies it can draw on in trying to carry out this complex project.

The project's lack of experience with the local PIC and JTPA requirements, and its lack of faith in the public employment and training system are the critical problems for service delivery in Philadelphia. Neither staff nor participants are confident in the ability of JTPA programs to meet the needs of fathers; to offer anything but dead-end jobs; or to provide a sufficient choice of training programs of interest to young men. It was well into program operations, and only after several meetings with PIC staff, that program staff even began attempting to understand JTPA regulations and offerings, and putting program participants through the JTPA-eligibility process. In the meantime, the Philadelphia program attempted to put together alternative job-readiness and training services.

No participants have received formal job-readiness services, but the program has placed 11 fathers (28% of the out-of-school track) in informal "on-the-job training" positions that program staff developed with two local employers without assistance from JTPA. One of these employers has also helped provide mentors to work with the young men on work-related and personal issues. Some of the on-the-job (OJT) training placements were only short-term, but five of the 11 fathers were still "on the job" at the end of May and one has since moved into a permanent position. Overall, however, it is clear that be-

cause they lack JTPA support, the program's employment and training efforts are having minimal results.

The Pinellas PIC has also lagged in putting together employment-related services for young fathers. At the outset, it appeared that the St. Petersburg program would have access to resources to organize and deliver employment services to this population, especially since, in theory, a number of JTPA resources are available. Also, the PIC is known for its excellent vocational assessment system, and job-readiness training is available through a "work maturity" and life skills curriculum. Education and skills training are offered by the Pinellas Technical Education Center. However, fathers in the program have among the lowest participation rates in education (23%) and job-readiness services (27%).

There are four principal reasons for the weakness of the St. Petersburg program. First, the Pinellas PIC's strong suit is planning and administration, not operations. Also, its prime operating subcontractor, a capable community-based corporation with strong ties in the minority community, went out of business just prior to project start-up. Thus, the PIC has been forced to develop direct operational program capacity as well as earn a reputation in the minority community.

Second, about half the fathers enrolled in the project are not eligible for JTPA services and therefore cannot participate in education and training services. (Almost one-third of the fathers in St. Petersburg were employed at program entry, and a number of others did not meet JTPA household income requirements.) Third, education and skills training slots in the Pinellas Technical Education Center are often not available when eligible fathers are able to attend. Finally, unlike other sites with JTPA funding, the Pinellas PIC does not offer participant stipends or needs-based payments. (Most of the local JTPA support services dollars are currently funding day care slots for AFDC clients participating in JTPA programs.) Thus, a large percentage of the enrolled fathers choose to find their own work, limiting their participation in program components.

Education

Our purpose in including the delivery of education services among the guiding principles for this pilot was to encourage sites to involve fathers in education services that would enhance their employability. As indicated earlier, the availability of JTPA resources in Cleveland and Fresno has helped facilitate the provision of education services in those sites. Ninety percent of the fathers in the Cleveland program who were eligible for education services, and 60 percent of the fathers in Fresno enrolled in education classes. (See Table 8.) In Cleveland and Fresno, fathers are enrolled in education classes as part of the up-front component.

In Racine, where a significant percentage of fathers (63%) also have enrolled in education services, classes are provided in the up-front component, but with funds provided by

Gateway Technical College. Of the other three sites, which to date have had difficulty packaging and delivering employment-related services, only Annapolis has been able to enroll a significant number of fathers in education (67%). However, because a large number of the Annapolis fathers are working (more than half, a third of whom were employed prior to the program), and because of initial scheduling problems at the center, they have spent an average of less than two hours a week on education skills. Although three fathers were scheduled to take their GED examination in August 1992, progress has been much slower in Annapolis than in sites with more intensive up-front services.

In St. Petersburg, very few fathers have taken advantage of the education services offered by the Pinellas Technical Education Center. In Philadelphia, almost half the fathers in the out-of-school track entered with either a high school diploma or a GED (19 of 40 fathers), but the program's inability to provide education services for the ungraduated half underlines the difficulties involved with soliciting off-site services. While the strategy of subcontracting for services has proven effective in Fresno, where there has been a long-standing involvement between the program provider and the education provider, it has proven much more difficult for the Philadelphia site, which is attempting to build new interagency relationships on an "in-kind" basis.

Beyond working with fathers in their high school component, the Philadelphia site has struggled to pull together alternative education services for participants. A particular difficulty has been scheduling classes so they will not conflict with the fathers' work schedules. An agreement with a local community college to deliver education was not finalized until well into the program, after classes had begun. Only two fathers have attended GED classes, both beginning in mid-semester.

With financial assistance from the program, several other fathers have recently enrolled in summer college-level courses, and two fathers whose education assessments indicated that they are very close to earning a GED have received Pell grants to take a short GED preparation class and proceed to college-level classes. Also, the director of admissions at the college has agreed to act as a personal mentor to the fathers attending classes.

Overall, few fathers have completed education programs--even where enrollments are large, as in Cleveland and Racine. As shown in Table 8, 55 percent of the young fathers across sites had participated in education services by the end of February 1992. Some had entered with a high school diploma or GED but were somewhat lacking in reading, writing or math skills, and enrolled in the education services to brush up; some entered with very low academic skills and have been in pre-GED classes; some have taken GED preparation classes; and a very small number are attending college. Of the 125 fathers who had received education services through February, 37.6 percent were still active at the end of February; 14.4 percent had completed a basic skills component and were no longer active in education; 13.6 percent had obtained a GED; and 34.4 percent had left the education component with no reported achievements.

There appear to be two principal and related reasons for this record. First, the project was sold in all sites primarily as a jobs program, not an education program, and young men who participate have to be convinced that there is a connection between education and their "good jobs" goal. Second, income is of overriding importance for this population. Although many of the fathers have severe academic deficiencies to address in order to improve their labor market chances, the lack of in-program financial support in all but one site has made it impossible for many fathers to participate in long-term education. In Fresno, the only site where significant in-program financial support is offered, completion rates for education services were highest.

Job Placement

As emphasized in the pilot principles, a "good job" is the desired outcome among young fathers participating in program training services. Given the aim of the pilot to have programs work with fathers over an 18-month period--and the likelihood that many of these fathers will change jobs during this time period--drawing conclusions about employment outcomes would be premature. However, the early experience with job placement provides an initial view of the sites' capacity to prepare this population for jobs and help place them in the labor market.

Tables 9 through 12 show data on the fathers' jobs during program participation. Through February, 84 fathers (37%) had secured jobs. The majority of these fathers (60, or 71%) had one job during the period; 15 (18%) had held two jobs; five held three jobs, and four held four jobs, for a total of 121 jobs. Of the first jobs held, 28 percent paid full or partial health benefits, the average hourly wage was $5.03, and the average hours worked was 34.

St. Petersburg reported the highest percentage of fathers in jobs, followed by Annapolis and Racine. The jobs must be seen not just in light of quantity, but quality (in terms of wages and benefits) and the role of program services in finding jobs for fathers. Across the sites, 42.5 percent of the fathers secured their first job as the result of program services: referral or the job search component.

Cleveland has the best record in placing fathers. While its "Beat the Streets" program does not have the highest rate of participants employed, the data in Tables 10 and 11 show that it comes closest to reaching the project's goal of finding "good jobs" for the young fathers. "Beat the Streets," which sold itself most aggressively as a jobs project, had the greatest number of job placements with full or partial benefits; was the only project in which fathers averaged close to a 40-hour work week; and recorded the highest average earnings--though average hourly wages fall below those of other sites.

Cleveland's performance reflects its success in packaging and delivering JTPA resources to prepare fathers for the labor market. A larger percentage of participants than in any other site used program resources in the job search. As shown in Table 12, "program

Table 9

FATHERS' WORK HISTORY DURING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Site	Number of Participants				Total Number of Participants Employed	Percentage of Total Program Participants Employed
	1 Job	2 Jobs	3 Jobs	4 Jobs		
St. Petersburg	11	3	0	1	15	68%
Cleveland	11	4	0	0	15	39
Annapolis	13	0	1	1	15	63
Fresno[a]	3	0	0	0	3	8
Racine	14	8	4	2	28	58
Philadelphia[b]	8	0	0	0	8	14
Total (Percentage of those employed)	60 (71%)	15 (18%)	5 (6%)	4 (5%)	84	37%

Note: Programs' start-up dates varied.

[a]Fresno fathers had not entered the job-search phase at the end of February.

[b]The Philadelphia site also placed 11 fathers in non-JTPA "on-the-job training" positions.

Table 10

WAGES AND HOURS--FIRST JOB (AS OF FEBRUARY 1992)

Site	Average Hourly Wage	Average Weekly Hours	Average Weekly Wage
St. Petersburg (n=14)	$4.36	30.7	$133.9
Cleveland (n=15)	5.39	39.3	211.8
Annapolis (n=14)	5.96	32.8	195.5
Fresno (n=3)[a]	4.53	24.0	108.7
Racine (n=28)	4.56	36.3	165.5
Philadelphia (n=7)	5.78	28.7	165.9
All sites (n=81)	5.03	34.2	171.7

Note: Data are missing for three fathers.

[a]Only three fathers in Fresno had entered employment as of the end of February due to the lengthy preemployment component in that site.

Table 11

HEALTH BENEFITS--FIRST JOB

Site	Full	Partial	None
St. Petersburg (n=15)	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%
Cleveland (n=15)	13.3	80.0	6.7
Annapolis (n=15)	0.0	33.3	66.7
Fresno (n=3)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Racine (n=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4
Philadelphia (n=8)	0.0	12.5	87.5
All sites (n=84)	2.4	26.2	71.4

Table 12

HOW PARTICIPANTS OBTAINED FIRST JOB BY SITE

	ST. PETERSBURG (n = 14)	CLEVELAND (n = 14)	ANNAPOLIS (n = 14)	FRESNO (n = 3)	RACINE (n = 28)	PHILADELPHIA (n = 7)	ALL SITES (n = 80)
Referral	7.1%	64.3%	28.6%[a]	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	27.5%
Job Search	14.3	21.4	7.1	33.3	3.6	57.1[b]	15.0
Independently	64.3	14.3	28.6	33.3	67.9	28.6	46.3
Prior Employment	14.3	0.0	35.7	33.3	0.0	14.3	11.3

Note: Data are missing for four fathers. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

[a]In Annapolis, job referrals are made by program staff. These efforts are not funded by JTPA.

[b]In Philadelphia, job-search refers to efforts made by program staff to assist fathers in finding employment. These efforts are not funded by JTPA.

referrals" and "job-search services," both part of Cleveland's JTPA-funded job-readiness services, were the two most frequently given responses by its youth.

Racine, which has also made relatively good use of JTPA resources for job preparation services, has a significant percentage (58%) of participants employed. However, the data indicate that the wages and benefits of Racine's jobs do not match those of Cleveland's. The majority of fathers in Racine are mandated to participate by the Child Support System; thus, while the system agrees to allow fathers to participate in this project, they face significant pressure to get a job as quickly as possible and begin making support payments. This often affects the intensity with which fathers participate in services. (Table 8 shows that only 42 percent of fathers in Racine participated in job-readiness services, compared with 87 percent in Cleveland and 100 percent in Fresno.) It also leads some fathers to take jobs that are less than "good," and to use their own resources to secure jobs rather than go through a program process. A significant percentage of employed fathers in Racine (68%) indicated that they found jobs independently.

The job placement experience of St. Petersburg, Annapolis and Philadelphia directly reflects the lack of programmatic resources (i.e., JTPA) for training and placement. As mentioned earlier, St. Petersburg and Annapolis have the highest percentages of program participants employed (68% in St. Petersburg and 63% in Annapolis). However, the data show that these jobs are not, for the most part, the result of program efforts to prepare fathers for "good jobs," but instead reflect attempts on the part of the fathers to continue to support themselves in the absence of solid program services, including in-program financial support. In each of these sites, many fathers indicated that they either found jobs independently (64% of the respondents in St. Petersburg) or were still working at jobs they held before joining the program (35.7 percent of the respondents in Annapolis). In Philadelphia, attempts are being made to develop jobs outside the JTPA system. In addition to placing 11 fathers in informal OJT positions developed by program staff, the Philadelphia Children's Network is attempting to find employers willing to provide permanent employment. At this point, not enough fathers have been placed to assess the viability of these efforts.

Because of the structure of the Fresno program, which mandates up-front job preparation and skills training before placement, very few fathers had been scheduled for placement in time to allow their inclusion in this report.

While it is too early to draw conclusions, initial job-retention data may indicate the difficulties fathers face in the labor market, and the challenge that helping them retain solid employment represents to programs--even those that, like Cleveland, have relatively strong placement capacity. Of the 84 young fathers who had jobs during the first 12 months of the project, 44 (52%) were still employed at the end of February. Of the 121 total jobs acquired, there were 77 terminations: 28 jobs (36% of all terminations) ended in discharge; 44 (57%) ended because the jobs were phased out; and five fathers (7%) quit their jobs.

Table 13 shows that St. Petersburg (80%), Racine (61%) and Annapolis (47%) had the best initial retention rates. At the end of February, Fresno had yet to make any significant job placements, and most of the placements in Philadelphia--aside from informal OJT (50 percent of those so placed were still in these training positions at the end of February)--were in temporary seasonal work.

What was most disappointing and surprising, particularly given the program's ability to obtain jobs with benefits and reasonably high wages, is the job-retention rate for Cleveland at the end of February: only 27 percent. (However, preliminary data for May 1992 are more encouraging, showing that Cleveland's job retention had increased to 50 percent. This improvement may reflect the Cleveland program's ability to find new jobs for displaced participants.)

These data raise interesting questions about the capacity of sites to meet the challenge of finding fathers more permanent jobs while recognizing the developmental stage of these young men and the effect their youth may have on job stability. Of course, the fathers' labor market experience so far and the ability of programs to help them must also be considered in light of current economic conditions. In 1990, nearly 36 percent of workers aged 18 to 24 were in low paying jobs, compared with 18 percent in 1979. Also, there appear to be fewer opportunities for the newly unemployed, like many of the young fathers in this project, to obtain "good" jobs that offer adequate pay and benefits; and the unemployment rate among young black men (aged 20 to 24) was 17.9 percent in 1989.

Issues in Utilizing the JTPA System

The initial performance of the sites in implementing the project's first principle points to several issues surrounding the use of the JTPA system to assist young fathers.

Determining Who Is Eligible

As mentioned in the recruitment discussion (Chapter II), staff in many of the programs said that the process for determining fathers' JTPA eligibility is arduous. Some sites say that the paperwork alone has caused them to lose potential participants. Many of the young men who come to these programs have difficulty locating all the documents needed to assess their eligibility, and some get frustrated with the process.

A second problem is the JTPA eligibility criteria--mainly with regard to income and basic skills level. Income eligibility is based on household rather than individual income. Many young fathers live with other family members and the income of others in the household is considered in the eligibility process. Also, fathers who have worked and earned a certain dollar amount during the year prior to applying for program participation may be ruled ineligible for JTPA. Finally, local SDAs often have strict criteria regarding reading level at entry, and in some instances, fathers have scored either too high or too low on eligibility assessment tests.

Table 13

JOB RETENTION BY SITE

Site	Number of participants employed, through February 1992	Percentage of those employed still employed at the end of February 1992
St. Petersburg	15	80%
Cleveland	15	27
Annapolis	15	47
Fresno	3	100
Racine	28	61
Philadelphia	8	13
All sites	84	52%

These problems have been especially troublesome for site staff, many of whom report seeing fathers who "obviously need the project's services" but are ineligible. Many staff feel the JTPA criteria are unrealistic for this population; according to one, "JTPA looks for reasons not to accept people."

In programs like those in Racine and Cleveland, other funding sources can be used to cover JTPA-ineligible fathers. In St. Petersburg, where JTPA is the major source of funds, non-eligible participants are admitted, but the services in which they can participate are limited. The fact that a large number of St. Petersburg's current participants are not JTPA-eligible partly explains the site's low rate of participation in training and education services; many fathers in the program have participated consistently only in the fatherhood curriculum sessions.

In Philadelphia and Annapolis, where there is little experience or involvement with the JTPA system, problems associated with eligibility seem to add to the staff's discouragement with the system and reinforce their tendency to avoid involvement with JTPA. Consequently, they fail to take advantage of services that might be available to their programs and some of their fathers.

Adequacy of JTPA Offerings and Support

The limited data that are available so far indicate that fathers will participate in training services that are accessible to them and that meet their needs. The most dramatic example of this is the large percentage of fathers in the Cleveland, Racine and Fresno programs who have completed on-site job-readiness services. The key question is whether the JTPA offerings available to fathers, even in sites with the most promising service delivery approaches, are strong enough to lead to the ultimate outcome of "good jobs" for these young men. As indicated earlier, the majority of training engaged in and offered at the site level to date has been preemployment, work maturity (e.g., life skills or motivational curricula) or job search. Even sites with effective service delivery approaches have offered very little real skills training.

The Fresno PIC is the only organization that routinely refers participants to skills training prior to placement, and plans to use OJT as a training strategy. This training and placement strategy is reflected in the low number of job placements that have been made in the project to date. Other JTPA agencies have been wary of using OJT since a federal review by the General Accounting Office called attention to abuses of the approach (e.g., employers taking a participant on for "training" in order to receive the OJT subsidy--50 percent of the wage--but with no systematic training being provided beyond that provided to regular employees). New guidelines require of the JTPA system and the employer a very thorough statement of the training intended and the number of hours involved. JTPA organizations indicated that because of their age and reputation as a "high-risk" group, young fathers are not considered strong job candidates by potential OJT employers, and are therefore not worth the trouble.

The timely availability of training slots has also been a problem, primarily in Fresno and St. Petersburg. Frequently, fathers in these programs must wait for a training vacancy. The availability of other services for fathers in the Fresno program has made these waiting periods somewhat easier to deal with, but such is not the case in St. Petersburg.

Finally, there is the lack of stipends sufficient to support fathers during an extended training period. The data presented in Chapter III indicate that many fathers have substantial financial support responsibilities, and Fresno is the only site that provides a (relatively) substantial stipend--up to $90 per week. The fact that Cleveland and Racine provide only minimal allowances and incentive payments during training leads fathers (and the programs) to focus on getting jobs as soon as possible--rather than on long-term training that might improve their skills. The lack of any in-program financial support at all in St. Petersburg, and the fact that Philadelphia and Annapolis have been unable to access JTPA training and take advantage of the limited JTPA stipends available ($5 a day in Annapolis, $2 an hour up to a maximum of $10 a day in Philadelphia) make in-program training almost impossible in these sites.

Absent or limited stipends may also prevent fathers from spending the time needed to improve skills deficiencies in a JTPA-funded education component. Data on the characteristics of this population indicate that, generally, academic skills deficiencies are severe. However, the data on education services indicate that fewer are completing these services than the job-readiness services. Fresno, the site with the highest stipends available, has the best completion rate. Because of the lack of in-program financial support, fathers may not be willing to spend the time necessary for effective remediation, which could limit their opportunities in the labor market.

FATHERHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Issues other than employment and employability also have a profound impact on these young men's lives, most critically their roles as parents. Accordingly, the programs have instituted fatherhood development activities designed to increase parental skills and responsibilities.

The fatherhood development component has two goals: 1) testing the receptivity of young fathers to project components and activities designed specifically to address their needs as young men and fathers; and 2) determining whether a program that focuses on both employability and support for fatherhood can affect parenting behavior, specifically the fathers' relationships with their children, establishment of paternity and payment of child support.

The foundation of this component is P/PV's Fatherhood Development Curriculum, designed to be delivered at each site and to address issues of manhood and fatherhood, especially single fatherhood and noncustodial parenting; communication; relationships

with significant others; sexuality and health; and personal responsibility. (A list of curriculum sessions is included in this report as Appendix D.)

Sites were also encouraged to develop other activities that would support the young men in their roles as fathers, including "leadership development" activities, which P/PV stimulated with a small ($5K) grant.

The Fatherhood Development Curriculum

The curriculum was developed by a team of P/PV consultants in conjunction with P/PV staff and outside advisors. The team emphasized central themes that young, mostly minority men and fathers would have to explore in order to become self-sufficient adults and more responsible parents: What does it mean to be a man? What role can a father play in the life of his child, especially if he does not live with the child or cannot always provide adequate financial support? What are a father's legal rights to and responsibilities for his children if he does not live with them? How can productive relationships with significant others (children, the children's mother, other family members, friends, employers, etc.) be developed and maintained? What is responsible sexual behavior? What are the steps to self-sufficiency?

While the curriculum's major focus is on manhood and fatherhood, lessons and exercises also encourage the young men to consider the mother's perspective on the issues addressed.

Prior to the start of the pilot, two days of training were held by the curriculum development team for project staff from all six sites. Outside consultants with expertise in areas related to the curriculum's key themes conducted workshops, and a panel of young fathers who closely fit the profile of the fathers who would be recruited for the project was engaged to respond to questions from staff and provide feedback on the lessons and exercises. Additional training sessions were held both centrally and at each site throughout the project's first year, serving not only to train staff but to allow the development team to get direct feedback from project staff and participating fathers, and revise the material accordingly.

While the curriculum delivery strategy was left to individual programs, all sites were required to hold curriculum sessions at least once a week for 60 to 90 minutes. This delivery approach provides sites with a means of maintaining a connection with participants, especially after they begin working.

The curriculum has been extremely well-received in all the pilot sites, and the opportunity to gather on a regular basis seems to have been as important to the fathers as the curriculum material itself. Nearly all fathers in the program (99 percent) have taken part. Even in Philadelphia, St. Petersburg and Annapolis, sites where other services have proved difficult to pull together, staff have delivered the curriculum regularly in response

to fathers' eagerness for the sessions, with the curriculum meetings having become the main focus of the programs. In fact, data on attendance rates for curriculum sessions show that these three sites' attendance is comparable to that of the other sites.

The solid, trusting relationship between the curriculum delivery staff and the fathers has greatly contributed to the pivotal role the curriculum has played in the project. In three of the six sites--Annapolis, Philadelphia and St. Petersburg--the curriculum facilitators are African-American men; in Fresno and Racine, staff delivering the curriculum are African-American men and women; and in Cleveland, facilitation is split between a white man and an African-American woman. To date, the experience seems to indicate that while race and sex can be key determinants of the ability of staff to engage participants, the most important factor is an ability to relate to fathers on their own terms, gain their trust, and challenge them to improve themselves as fathers and as men.

The projectwide attendance rate over the first 12 months of the pilot was 60 percent, with a core group of just over 10 percent of participants having rarely missed a session over the entire period. An operational issue faced by all sites is keeping the fathers, especially those who are working, coming to curriculum sessions consistently. As the data in Table 14 show, the average curriculum attendance rate across the pilot sites was very high during the fathers' first two months in the program (81% in the first month of participation and 69% in the second). However, as fathers moved through the other components of the program and began to enter employment, attendance rates dropped. Still, most participants continue to attend some sessions, and the turnout for special events organized by the leadership group has been good across the sites.

In an attempt to encourage fathers' consistent participation in curriculum activities, sites have instituted a number of strategies, such as Saturday and evening sessions, meeting with varying degrees of success. Nevertheless, site staff credit the curriculum itself with keeping fathers connected to the program; they also gave the curriculum credit for the high overall program retention rate so far (80%).

Other Fatherhood Development Activity

The degree to which the sites have engaged fathers in other fatherhood and leadership activities has depended on the initiative and leadership of staff at each site. Most sites have developed activities to complement the curriculum lessons, such as bringing in outside speakers and encouraging fathers to organize activities that include their families, especially their children.

One of the most active sites in this area has been Racine. According to staff, developing leadership skills in their participants is exactly what Goodwill Industries is about. The site has an active fathers' association that plans activities, such as the "Father of the Year" banquet, and organized a mothers' auxiliary to participate in curriculum sessions

Table 14

CURRICULUM ATTENDANCE BY MONTH OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Month in Program	Number of Participants Scheduled for Curriculum	Average Attendance Rate
1	186	80.5%
2	177	68.7
3	164	58.6
4	132	54.5
5	107	48.0
6	88	49.2
7	83	39.9
8	71	31.6
9	57	29.6
10	32	30.5
11	16	43.8
12	8	40.6

and other program activities. Other sites have not organized formal associations, but the fathers have taken an active role in planning activities.

Examples of such activities include:

- Fresno: The fathers organized a picnic, played a touch football game against project staff and arranged a trip to Disneyland; the two leaders participated in a series of local television talk shows.

- Annapolis: The fathers planned and cooked Thanksgiving dinner for their children and other family members; the fathers also used some of their leadership money to fund a trip to meet with fathers--and participate in a Fatherhood Development Curriculum session--at the Philadelphia site.

- Philadelphia: Fathers held a Christmas party for their children and arranged food baskets for the homeless.

- Cleveland: The fathers have met regularly on the weekends, have taken their children out to eat as a group and held a family barbecue.

- St. Petersburg: The fathers have formed particularly strong group ties--they often get together informally outside of program hours for impromptu fishing trips or joint activities with their children.

Establishing Paternity and Paying Child Support

The degree to which the focus on fatherhood will result in fathers establishing paternity and paying child support, especially fathers who are already providing "off the books" support for their children, is difficult to determine at this point. This program requirement has been controversial, and the experience of the sites points again to the issues involving the child support system that are faced by this population and the programs that attempt to serve them.

Table 15 shows data on paternity establishment, the first step in the support payment process. A significant number of fathers (47%) entered the pilot with paternity established. The highest percentages are in the Racine, Fresno and St. Petersburg programs, where many referrals came from the child support system, and Annapolis, where the local child support agency is very aggressive in establishing and collecting child support. Eleven percent of the young men in the sample have established paternity since they have been in the project, leaving 42 percent yet to take this step.[16] The sites with the

[16] These paternity establishment numbers are based on reports from sites and have yet to be confirmed with local child support agencies.

Table 15

PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT BY SITE

Site	n	Percentage Establishing Paternity Prior to Program Entry	Percentage Establishing Paternity in Program	Percentage With Paternity Not Established (As of February 1992)
St. Petersburg	22	41	23	36
Cleveland	38	5	16	79
Annapolis	24	54	4	42
Fresno	39	100	0	0
Racine	48	90	10	0
Philadelphia	57	4	12	84
All Sites	228	47%	11%	42%

lowest rates of prior paternity establishment, Cleveland and Philadelphia, also have the weakest links with their child support agencies.[17]

To participate in the project, each of the six sites agreed to help young fathers take on their legal child support responsibilities. Initially, our direction to the sites was to require fathers who had not taken this step to commit to doing so at program entry. For programs with initial plans to recruit exclusively through the CSE system--Fresno, St. Petersburg and Racine--this was not a problem, since applicants would already be in the system (though it did present problems for St. Petersburg when the recruitment strategy was adjusted to include community outreach). In fact, Fresno's initial strategy of recruiting through CSE was based on a desire to avoid "entrapping" fathers into paternity establishment.

For Philadelphia, Cleveland and Annapolis, which relied on general community recruitment and referrals, the paternity establishment directive caused two problems. First, the up-front paternity establishment/child support commitment interfered with recruitment. Second, staff in these sites balked when faced with the reality of "turning young men over to the Child Support System."

At a basic level, the staff in these programs, and the organizations themselves (much like the Fresno PIC), felt that cooperating with the child support system was not part of their purpose and mission as service providers and advocates. They argued that paternity establishment should be part of the program process; and that they needed time to work with the young fathers and gain their trust. The fathers, they said, needed time to absorb the lessons of the curriculum, and to understand better their rights and responsibilities before entering into the "18-year commitment" of child support. Eventually, it was agreed that staff would work with young fathers and over time encourage them to "do the right thing."

Over the course of the project, programs have taken steps (encouraged by P/PV) to help educate participants and themselves about the paternity establishment process and about the rights and responsibilities of noncustodial parents. At Cleveland Works, staff lawyers have held workshops for participants and staff; at all other sites, volunteer attorneys (and in the case of Philadelphia, a judge) held on-site workshops. Also, the Fatherhood Development Curriculum was strengthened in this key area.

Despite all this activity, paternity establishment continues to present problems; the relevant issues are reviewed in the following sections.

---

[17] The Cleveland and Philadelphia sites are also situated in the two largest urban areas of the pilot. It may be that paternity establishment and child support orders are more difficult to enforce in such areas because of the greater number of cases, the higher volume of court dockets and a lack of available jail space.

Institutional Relationships

One of the key questions for the pilot project is whether employment and training programs, specifically the JTPA system, and the CSE system can coordinate strategies to help young fathers become more productive parents. In designing project operations, we encouraged sites to recruit fathers from the CSE system and pursue agreements that would allow some level of "latitude" regarding the father's child support obligations while he participated in a training program designed to improve his long-term employability and ability to pay child support.

The recruitment story was told earlier. In this sample, approximately one-third of the fathers were referred through the CSE system. Most (one-half) were mandatory referrals to the Racine site--if these fathers do not stay with the program, imprisonment is a real possibility. The balance are volunteers participating in Fresno (22%) and St. Petersburg (14%), and a small number of voluntary court referrals in Philadelphia, Cleveland and Annapolis.

In developing this program component, we found that the policy and practice of the local CSE jurisdiction greatly influence the quality of the employment and training experience of CSE-referred fathers. The experience of fathers in the two sites with the highest percentage of CSE referrals, Racine and Fresno, illustrate this best.

In Fresno, a child support judgement is not entered until a father has a job. Therefore, some fathers in the Fresno program have been referred by the court; because they have not held a job, however, they do not have child support orders. These fathers can participate in the Fresno POP program without interference from the system until they are placed in a job, at which time a child support order is entered and they are obligated to begin payment. Fathers with a work history--and therefore an existing order--are relieved of making full child support payments while they are in the program and not working. In an agreement with CSE, the program has agreed to deduct from the father's training stipend a minimal payment of $10 per week toward his child support obligation. This combination of local practice and creative cooperation between the JTPA and CSE systems makes it possible for the Fresno participants to extend job training in preparation for work, and may help them achieve the "good jobs" goal in that site.

The Racine project, on the other hand, is located in the "tough child support" state of Wisconsin, which has had a significant impact on the practices of the local CSE agency. All CSE-referred fathers in the Racine project are behind in child support payments. While the courts agree that their payments can be suspended while they participate in the Young Fathers Program, the amount owed continues to accumulate as arrearages, and there is constant pressure placed on the fathers to get a job as soon as possible and resume payments--largely in the form of regular meetings with court workers. According to project staff, this often leads program participants to cut training time short to take jobs. This accounts for the lower participation (than in Fresno and Cleveland) of Racine

fathers in job-readiness classes and for the mediocre quality of job placements in this site. In the Racine project, the program's longer-term "good jobs" goal appears to be in conflict with CSE's goal of getting child support payments as quickly as possible.

The Annapolis project has not been able to develop an effective relationship with the CSE agency. Although there is a written agreement to refer potential fathers to the program and monitor their progress, there is no commitment to either reduce or suspend child support obligations during program participation. Like Racine, Annapolis is in a tough child support jurisdiction, and fathers with child support orders face a great deal of pressure to work; in fact, six fathers in the program have already been jailed for failure to pay child support. In addition to the general lack of available services in Annapolis, this type of pressure from CSE has hindered some fathers' ability to participate fully in the services available (primarily education), and is also reflected in the high percentage of fathers who are working.

Similarly, in St. Petersburg, there is no formal agreement to reduce or suspend obligations, though it has been possible to offer leeway to program participants on a case-by-case basis. The CSE agency may accept less than the court-ordered support payments from program participants. These payments neither postpone nor negate any accrued child support or AFDC debts, but can forestall contempt-of-court action for nonpayment.

In Philadelphia and Cleveland, there is no formal relationship with the CSE system and few fathers had established paternity on entering the programs. Therefore, there has been little involvement with the CSE system, something that will change as more fathers attempt to establish paternity.

Disincentives to Paternity Establishment

Establishing paternity is not a simple process. It can take up to six months, and if the mother does not cooperate, legal complexities and expenses increase. Also, once the father has established paternity, a child support order is entered, and in most cases, payments become due very quickly. Some project staff, and fathers who have gone through the process, describe it as a potential financial disaster for the father and, in some cases, for the mother and child.

In most localities, a father who is not working and cannot make payments begins to build up arrearages right away. Fresno, where orders are not in effect until the father has a job, is the exception. Even in Fresno, however, no arrangements have been made to prevent arrearages from accruing for the small number of fathers who entered the program with an existing child support order.

If the father is working, the deduction from his pay can be a shock, especially given the salaries fathers have reported. In addition, if the mother of his child(ren) is on AFDC, only $50 of his payment will actually be "passed through" to the mother, with the rest

subsumed into the AFDC payments. Thus, if the father has been paying more than $50 "off the books" to supplement the mother's AFDC grant, as many fathers in our sample reported doing, the actual income of his child's household will be reduced--unless the father is able to increase his payments accordingly. These factors make paternity establishment a "hard sell" for many young fathers, though program staff report that they are beginning to see success from teaching young fathers about its long-term benefits for them and their children.

Interestingly, the preliminary data show that sites with the highest job-retention rates also have the highest paternity establishment rates. (See Tables 13 and 15.) Could the reality of an official child support obligation be an incentive for maintaining employment? This possibility does not weaken the argument that these fathers might benefit from a reduction or suspension of child support obligations while they pursue education and/or training designed to help them achieve long-term employment goals. However, stronger data in this regard might argue for establishment of paternity and child support obligations as a motivator for job retention.

COUNSELING AND OTHER ONGOING SUPPORT

All sites report providing counseling services to a large proportion of their participants. Cleveland, which has a large in-house counseling staff, reports that 100 percent of its fathers received counseling of some kind. At the other end of the spectrum, St. Petersburg has the lowest participation in counseling services (59%). Even in Philadelphia and Annapolis, which have had difficulty packaging employment and training services for fathers, a great deal of staff time has been spent attempting to assist fathers through counseling: 83 percent of Annapolis fathers and 74 percent of Philadelphia fathers received counseling.

Across the sites, the most frequent type of counseling provided was career (59%), followed by personal (38%) and legal (30%). Legal counseling primarily involved helping fathers understand their parental rights and responsibilities in preparation for declaration of paternity and payment of child support.

We have encouraged programs to obtain volunteer legal support for their programs. The sites that have been most aggressive in obtaining this support are Cleveland and Philadelphia, with the most fathers who have yet to declare paternity, and Annapolis, where fathers have been jailed for failure to pay support.

Referrals to outside agencies have been made for fathers who need assistance with housing, drug and alcohol abuse, and health problems, though site staff in several programs indicate that access to these services in the community is limited. Only about 10 percent of participants have been referred for assistance in each of these areas. Sites were encouraged to provide fathers with health services. In all sites except St. Petersburg, arrangements were made for fathers to receive some level of health care--some

more comprehensive than others. However, few or no fathers have actually been referred for health services thus far.

ESTABLISHING A LONG-TERM CONNECTION

Programmatic experience with high-risk populations indicates that overcoming long-term deficits is not an overnight process; it requires a substantial period of involvement. The pilot principle calling for programs to engage fathers for 18 months represents an attempt to connect fathers with services that will support them over the long haul as they attempt to make changes in their lives.

At this point in the project, we can make only a preliminary assessment of how well programs will be able to comply with this principle. Through February, the retention rate across all the sites was 80 percent, and 41 percent of the fathers had been active for more than six months. Forty-five fathers (20%) had left the program; another 12 (5%) had left but subsequently reenrolled. The average length-of-stay for all first-time terminees was three months. By the end of May, among those who had enrolled and signed consent forms (287), the retention rate was 81 percent. More than half the active fathers had been enrolled for more than six months, and the average length-of-stay for terminees was 3.6 months.

These retention rates are very encouraging, especially since good retention appears to be consistent across the sites. All the pilot sites, even those that have not been able successfully to package employment and training services for fathers, are doing a good job of holding participants.

At this point, the key to the project's retention rate appears to be the Fatherhood Development Curriculum and the attraction of a program that speaks directly to participants' needs as fathers. Although, as discussed earlier, curriculum session attendance does drop over time, most participants continue to attend some sessions, and turnout for special events organized by the leadership groups has been high in all sites.

The issue of whether programs can continue to hold fathers and keep them connected to program services for 18 months, even after they are firmly in the labor market, is vital and will be followed closely as the project continues.

CONCLUSION

The early implementation experience of the six sites points to a number of key issues to consider regarding the organization and delivery of services to young fathers. The first is the importance of access to JTPA resources. Even though the sites confirm the clear limits of the JTPA system with regard to enrolling and supporting this target population, the data also indicate that the programs with good access to JTPA resources, and the

experience and knowledge to use them well, have done the best job of providing employment and training services to young fathers.

Second, the young men in this project have responded to efforts to engage them as fathers. Whether or not participation in fatherhood development activities will help fathers take on more responsibility, financial and otherwise, for their children remains to be seen. However, young fathers' interest in participating in fatherhood development sessions indicates that respectful recognition of young men's fatherhood and genuine attempts to aid its development may represent a "hook" for engaging otherwise disconnected young men in education and employment programs. A related issue is the need for better institutional relationships among the JTPA system, the programs that serve young men and the CSE system, which might facilitate fathers' fuller participation in program services and the achievement of the "good jobs" goal.

Finally, the need for program support services is evidenced by the high percentage of fathers in this project who receive counseling. Whether the level of support needed by young fathers is higher than that needed by other high-risk populations is difficult to say. However, this project highlights particularly this population's need for legal services, given their status as poor noncustodial parents and the large percentage who have been involved with the criminal justice system.

V. SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

The Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project's goals are to develop knowledge about a crucial group of youth--young unmarried men who become fathers at an early age--and to identify programmatic strategies and services that will engage them and help them become more responsible parents. Although the pilot project was designed specifically to inform a decision about whether to develop a national demonstration of any one model, we believe that the sites' early experience outlined in this interim report already provides important lessons for funders and the field; for public systems, such as JTPA and CSE; for public policy initiatives related to this population, such as the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration; and for the other welfare and child support reform initiatives currently under consideration.

This report has addressed three main questions: 1) What does it take to attract young fathers to the pilot's various programs? 2) Who are the fathers who volunteer, are referred and enroll? 3) Do the sites' abilities to provide training, employment and fatherhood development to this population in accordance with the pilot's principles seem promising?

The following sections present early findings in each of these areas, as well as discussion of the project's next steps.

1. The recruitment experience thus far has confirmed that attracting and enrolling young fathers, even in programs specifically designed for them, is difficult and resource-intensive.

Across all six sites, three major strategies were used to recruit young fathers: mandatory referrals from child support, voluntary referrals from child support and community outreach. Even in sites where recruitment has been most aggressive, enrollment has been slow.

There appear to be two major reasons for the difficulty in attracting enrollees. First, the data and discussions with site staff disclose that many young fathers, primarily those who fit the typical profile of the pilot participants (i.e., African American and poor), have little trust in public systems or belief that participation in a program like JTPA will actually be to their benefit.

Second, the required interaction with two major systems erects specific barriers to enrollment. For example, the CSE system is distrusted by many men, not just by this population, and by many of the organizations that have access to young men appropriate for this project. Also, JTPA-funded programs often require an arduous eligibility certification process; do not generally include financial support that would make participation more attractive to fathers, such as training stipends; and have not had good outcomes

with young minority men. Even among fathers who did enroll, a large majority indicated that their previous involvement with training programs was minimal.

However, through May 1992, approximately 300 young men did enroll at the six sites. Regardless of the strategy used by each site, there appear to be three factors involved in attracting enrollment. The first is credibility in the community and with the population. Fathers came forward and joined programs because of the credibility of program staff who personally vouched for the program, as in Annapolis and particularly in Philadelphia, which has enrolled the most fathers to date on little other than staff credibility; because of the reputation of the program or organization for providing good services and, particularly in Fresno, stipends; or because of the program's history of "making good" on promises of jobs, as in Cleveland.

The second factor appears to be strong, well-established relationships between young fathers' programs and referral sources. As the data reported here indicate, more than 46 percent of the fathers in the pilot were referred by other institutions. Although other sites exhibited this characteristic (notably Philadelphia, with its relationship with the schools, and Fresno, with its access to other youth programs), Racine's experience seems most illustrative. Its relatively successful recruitment was based almost entirely on an ongoing, established referral relationship with the CSE system.

The recruitment experience of sites with CSE connections is especially noteworthy because of the initial difficulties that St. Petersburg and Fresno had in establishing a flow of referrals from their local CSE system. This experience points to the specific need for better relationships among CBOs, the JTPA system and CSE agencies to facilitate recruitment of young fathers, as well as to the general difficulties of coordination, especially among organizations with vastly differing missions.

The third factor is organizational resources--the ability to staff and continue a strenuous outreach effort in order to attract and enroll fathers. In several sites, this ability has been key in the program's efforts to reach the targeted goal of 50 fathers.

Equally important to the issue of recruitment are its motivating factors. The fact that so many fathers said they enrolled to get jobs is not surprising in itself, though it does speak to the degree to which these fathers are interested in improving their employability, and their resilience in the face of previous unsuccessful experiences in the education system and labor market. What is somewhat surprising, due to common stereotypes about this population, is the degree to which fathers in many of the sites indicated their interest in improving their parenting skills and relationships with their children. These responses may well indicate that an appeal to fatherhood is a secondary "hook" for attracting young fathers and involving them in other activities that may be beneficial to their development (e.g., training and education).

In sum, specific lessons from the recruitment experience thus far are, first, that no one strategy seems best suited for attracting young fathers. More important for recruiting this population seems to be organizational credibility, a sound well-funded recruitment strategy, and solid connections to recruitment sources that have access to young fathers. Second, young fathers do appear to respond to appeals to their desire to develop as fathers.

These lessons provide important information for funders, policymakers and operators who are interested in attracting young fathers (and other young men like them) to public programs and who must consider the type of service providers and staff to engage. These preliminary findings are particularly useful at this time, given the elements in the JTPA amendments that emphasize better targeting of high-risk groups and coordination with CBOs, and the provision of needs-based payments when they are necessary for participation.

2. The young fathers who have enrolled are, for the most part, doing too poorly economically to support their children on a regular basis, but provide sporadic support and are eager for better jobs and for more contact with their children.

The findings regarding the characteristics of the fathers in this study present an interesting picture. One set of findings is not surprising. They illustrate the overall poverty of the group; their living arrangements and education deficiencies; their lack of preparation for the work force and their involvement with the criminal justice system; and their involvement with their children and their children's mothers. These data all corroborate or support studies cited earlier in this report. They also challenge the reference to many fathers in this project as "absent," since large percentages report being present in the lives of their children.

However, the data regarding the financial support fathers report providing for the care of their children, though self-reported and, according to site staff, probably inflated, is somewhat surprising. In the face of data that reflect poverty and limited work opportunities, this information indicates that some fathers are able to and do make substantial cash contributions (outside of legal child support payments) to the support of their children, even if (as staff say) the contributions are irregular. This finding underscores the expressed desire of many of the young fathers in the project to take on real parental responsibilities and be a significant part of their children's lives. It also points to a difficulty this population presents for the programs in this pilot--namely, how to convince young men to pay legal child support, when they can better support their children "off the books," even on an irregular basis; and for the CSE system, which, in light of these data, may need to consider alternative ways to bring young fathers into compliance with the law.

MDRC's Parents' Fair Share Demonstration, currently being conducted in nine states, will include several sites that will test strategies for encouraging flexibility in the child

support system, including simplifying and expediting the paternity establishment process, delaying or suspending orders (and therefore the accumulation of arrearages), and setting minimum orders during program participation. While the fathers in the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration will likely be older than those in the Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project (the average age is expected to be 30), we will be watching this project with interest, since the results are likely to have implications for all "absent" parents.

3. Access to JTPA resources appears critical to service delivery for young unwed fathers; however, current regulations and practice in both JTPA and CSE, and the limited coordination between the two systems, present barriers to service delivery for this population.

First, consider the JTPA system, which sites were required to use as part of their pilot efforts to provide fathers with training and good jobs. The first year of pilot operations indicates that only the most established program operators--in Cleveland, Racine and Fresno--with experience working with high-risk populations and strong ties to the JTPA system have been able to package a concrete set of services for this population. For sites like Philadelphia and Annapolis, which have no real access to JTPA, or St. Petersburg, which has no real experience with program delivery, the task has been daunting, and it shows in their service participation data so far.

But even sites with good access to the JTPA system have not been able to provide large numbers of young fathers with promising jobs, adequate education services or skills training. Limitations in the usefulness of JTPA-funded programs for these young men include local eligibility criteria or practices that screen out needy fathers, the lack of viable skills training options (including OJT) for this population, and the lack or meagerness of in-program financial support, which forces fathers to take jobs before they significantly improve their job-related skills. In fact, because of these limitations, one site, Philadelphia, has so little confidence in JTPA's ability to provide meaningful services for its participants that the program has virtually stopped trying to establish a relationship with the local PIC and has begun developing jobs and training opportunities for its fathers outside the JTPA system.

While fathers in the six sites have begun to take jobs, and while some of the initial job-placement activity looks promising (especially in the Cleveland site), it is too early to begin talking about program outcomes as a result of JTPA participation. The recent national JTPA study cited earlier in the report does not bode well, however, since it shows negative impacts on earnings for out-of-school male youth enrolled in JTPA programs.

Whether the recently passed JTPA amendments, which emphasize better needs assessment and service planning, access to appropriate education options for dropouts, and opportunities for quality skills training, including well-structured OJT, will strengthen services for this population remains to be seen, as does the usefulness for this population

of the Family Support Act's JOBS program--which is being tested in the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration.

Attempts to emphasize both employment and training, and fatherhood development in this project have also pointed to key institutional issues involving young fathers and the CSE system, and indicate the need for more cooperation between CSE and JTPA. Initial placement wage data from the Racine project, where there is significant pressure on young fathers with support orders to take jobs before they have significantly improved their skills, reflect the need for recognition by CSE that short-term training programs do little to improve the labor market prospects of high-risk youth, and are not likely to be useful in improving long-term ability to pay child support.

The Fatherhood Development Curriculum and the overall fatherhood focus of these programs appears to have real promise as a means of keeping fathers involved in the programs. Its role in a strategy for increasing the number of paternity establishments (and the number of fathers paying child support) is less certain.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE PILOT

The initial pilot phase of the Young Unwed Fathers Project was due to end in August 1992. Because of initial difficulties with recruitment, described in Chapter II, enrollment build-up at every site has been slower than expected. We are therefore planning to extend the pilot phase through August 1993 in order to have a larger sample for assessing program effects and the relation of effects to program approaches. This assessment will inform a conclusion about whether any of the models in the pilot are worthy of a more rigorous demonstration and assessment of impacts.

In particular, the extension will allow us to take a closer look at the fatherhood curriculum in four sites where the core sessions will be offered intensively during the up-front part of the program; to observe the ongoing development of interagency coordination; and to focus more on employment and training issues, such as the outcome of long-term training in Fresno, especially OJT, and the ability of all sites to help participants move toward the "good jobs" goal.

The outcomes study and cost analysis described in Chapter I will be part of the final report and are currently under way. The ethnographic study of project participants, also described earlier, is under way, and we expect to begin drawing on that work early next year for a series of popular and scholarly articles that will present for the broader public many of the lessons contained in this report.

REFERENCES

Abt Associates, Inc.
1992 The National JTPA Study: Title II-A Impacts on Earnings and Employment at 18 Months. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor. Bethesda, M.D.: Abt Associates, Inc.

Children's Defense Fund
1989 Budget for 1989. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

Children's Defense Fund
1988 Adolescent and Young Adult Fathers: Problems and Solutions. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

Danzinger, Sandra and Ann Nichols-Casebolt
1987/88 "Teen Parents and Child Support: Eligibility, Participation, and Payment." Journal of Social Service Research. Vol. 11, Nos. 2/3.

Hardy, Jane B. , Anne K. Duggan, Katya Masnyk and Carol Pearson
1989 "Fathers of Children Born to Young Urban Mothers." Family Planning Perspectives. Vol. 21, No. 4, July/August.

Kastner, Carolyn K., Laurene T. Mckillopp, Terri T. Nickel, Ronald D. Perry and Michele Rivest
1987 Child Support Services for Young Families: Current Issues and Future Directions. Report of Forum on Child Support Services for Young Families, Washington, D.C., September 28-29.

Lerman, Robert
1988 A National Profile of Young Unwed Fathers: Who Are They and How Are They Parenting? Commissioned paper for Young Unwed Fathers Conference, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C., June 1987.

Mauer, Marc
1990 Young Black Men and the Criminal Justice System: A Growing National Problem. Washington, D.C.: The Sentencing Project.

Mincy, Ronald
1989 What Has Happened to the Underclass During the Economic Recovery? Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Ooms, Theodora and Todd Owen
1990 Encouraging Unwed Fathers To Be Responsible: Paternity Establishment, Child Support and JOBS Strategies. Meeting Highlights and Background Briefing Report. Washington, D.C.: The Family Impact Seminar (FIS), The AAMFT Research and Education Foundation.

Rivera, Frederick P., Patrick J. Sweeney and Brady F. Henderson
1985 "A Study of Low Socioeconomic Status: Black Teenage Fathers and Their Non-Father Peers." Pediatrics. Vol. 75, No. 4, April.

Robinson, Bryan E.
1988 "Teenage Pregnancy From the Father's Perspective." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 58, January, pp. 46-51.

Sullivan, Mercer
1986 Ethnographic Research on Young Fathers and Parenting: Implications for Public Policy. Paper prepared for Conference of Unwed Fathers, Catholic University, Washington, D.C., October 1-3.

Sum, Andrew and Neal Fog
1989 The Changing Economic Fortunes of Young Black Men in the New American Economy of the 1980s. Boston: Northeastern University's Center for Labor Market Studies.

U.S. General Accounting Office
1990 Job Training Partnership Act. Youth Participant Characteristics, Services and Outcomes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Veum, Jonathan R.
1992 "Interrelation of Child Support, Visitation and Hours of Work." Monthly Labor Review. June.

Westat, Inc.
1991 Review of JTPA Participant Characteristics and Program Outcomes for Program Years 1984 Through 1989 (JTQS Special Paper No. 10). Prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. Rockville: Westat, Inc.

Wilson, William Julius
1987 The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A

SITE PROFILES

YOUNG FATHERS PROGRAM–ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

Contracting agency: Friends of the Family, Baltimore, Maryland

Operating agency: Anne Arundel County Department of Social Services.

Description of operating agency: Friends of the Family chose the Anne Arundel County Department of Social Services (DSS) as the lead agency for the project because of its experience, in conjunction with Anne Arundel County Community College, of operating two Community Learning Centers that provide a full range of education remediation programs. The Young Fathers Program operates out of one of these centers.

Staffing: One project coordinator/case manager; one part-time curriculum facilitator; one part-time project director.

Estimated expenditures: $79,300

Funding sources: Anne Arundel County DSS, $24,300 "in-kind;" P/PV, $55,000.

Recruitment approach: A combination of community outreach and some referrals from the child support system.

Services provided: Basic education and GED preparation services are provided on-site at the Community Learning Center. Participants work on individualized plans using personal computers. The curriculum is delivered two evenings a week. JTPA services are available through the Anne Arundel County Office of Manpower. Legal services are available through an attorney at the University of Maryland School of Law.

Specific population focus: Recruitment has focused on three local public housing complexes. All participants have been African American.

Other program features: This site has successfully employed a program participant as a recruiter.

BEAT THE STREETS–CLEVELAND, OHIO

Contracting agency: Cleveland Works

Operating agency: Cleveland Works

Description of operating agency: Cleveland Works is a comprehensive social service agency that has provided a wide variety of employment and training and support services to AFDC parents and their children since 1986.

Staffing: One full-time project director; two full-time counselors/curriculum facilitators; one full-time counselor/intake worker. Other staff devote time for education services and job development/placement services.

Estimated expenditures: $179,907

Funding sources: JTPA, $124,907 (prorated based on 39% participation rate); P/PV, $55,000.

Recruitment approach: Referrals are obtained from other clients, general community outreach, juvenile court judges and adult probation officers.

Services provided: All services are provided on-site. Participants go through a highly structured program that includes eight weeks of preemployment and basic skills training followed by placement either directly in permanent unsubsidized jobs or, if preferred by the employer, in transitional employment ("supported work") lasting up to three months, during which time the individual is an employee of Cleveland Works. Almost all the job placements to date have included partial health insurance coverage by the employer. The fatherhood curriculum is presented during the eight-week up-front phase, then on Saturdays.

Specific population focus: Beat the Streets is not solely a program for young fathers; rather, the program targets all young males in need of services. To date, about 39 percent of participants have been fathers.

Other program features: Legal services, health services and child care are available on-site.

PARENTING OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM–FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

Contracting agency: Fresno Private Industry Council (FPIC)

Operating agency: Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission (FCEOC)

Description of operating agency: FCEOC is FPIC's designated urban youth service provider. FCEOC was established in August 1965 and has an annual budget of approximately $31 million. FCEOC has operated a variety of employment and training programs under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and, since 1983, under JTPA.

Staffing: Two full-time case managers/curriculum facilitators; one part-time project coordinator; one part-time job developer. A percentage of time is also provided by FCEOC's director of employment and training, intake/assessment staff and clerical staff.

Estimated expenditures: $352,024

Funding sources: JTPA, $297,024; P/PV, $55,000.

Recruitment approach: The original plan was to recruit solely through the local child support enforcement agency, but was expanded to include referrals from existing FCEOC programs and general community outreach.

Services provided: All services are provided through JTPA. Participants receive a weekly stipend based on the number of hours of participation. A three-week up-front job-readiness class is provided on site; basic education and GED preparation services are provided through the Fresno Unified School District at the Center for Independent Education. Fatherhood curriculum is cofacilitated in two separate groups once a week. Participants go through a variety of skills training programs, including automotive mechanics, auto body and fender repair, data processing, emergency medical technician, air conditioning and refrigeration, and police cadet. This is the only site that is utilizing JTPA OJT slots. One staff person is assigned to work with the young fathers in the area of job development and job placement. Legal assistance is available from a local attorney who has volunteered her time.

Specific population focus: The original plan was to serve 16- to 21-year-old fathers who had already established paternity. Although the mean age is the lowest of the six sites (20.1), the original plan was modified to include some older fathers and some who had not established paternity.

Other program features: Participants receive a stipend of up to $90 a week, depending on the number of hours they spend in program components. If a father does not qualify for this JTPA benefit, P/PV funds are utilized. Health services are available to all participants through Kaiser Permanente.

RESPONSIVE FATHERS PROGRAM–PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Contracting agency: Philadelphia Children's Network

Operating agency: Philadelphia Children's Network (PCN)

Description of operating agency: PCN is a newly established (January 1990) nonprofit organization with a mission to improve the life chances of children and families in a specific community--West Philadelphia. The Responsive Fathers Program is part of this overall effort.

Staffing: One full-time project director/case manager; one full-time case manager; one part-time program administrator; three part-time high school coordinators; one part-time consultant; one part-time secretary.

Estimated expenditures: $275,000

Funding sources: AT&T, $25,000; Scott Paper Company, $30,000; P/PV, $55,000; City of Philadelphia, funds pending.

Recruitment approach: Community outreach through a network of community agencies, including schools, hospitals, teen pregnancy programs and churches.

Services provided: GED preparatory and college-level classes are available through the Community College of Philadelphia. Access to a limited range of JTPA-funded training programs is available through the local PIC. The curriculum is cofacilitated on a weekly basis. Two local employers have agreed to hold a small number of slots for program participants and provide OJT.

Specific population focus: This is the only site with a separate program track for in-school fathers. High school coordinators at three local schools are responsible for one-on-one counseling, tracking progress in school and delivering the curriculum on a weekly basis. All participants to date have been African American.

Other program features: There is also a mentoring component that has matched some fathers in the program with male volunteers.

YOUNG FATHERS PROGRAM–RACINE, WISCONSIN

Contracting agency: Goodwill Industries of Southeastern Wisconsin

Operating agency: Goodwill Industries of Southeastern Wisconsin

Description of operating agency: Goodwill Industries is a multiservice organization with a history of preparing people with multiple barriers to employment for work and independent living. Goodwill has been under contract with the Racine CSE agency since January 1990 to operate a court-ordered program for noncustodial parents of all ages who are behind in their child support payments and are either unemployed or underemployed.

Staffing: One full-time case manager; one part-time curriculum facilitator; one part-time project director. Other staff devote time for education services and job development/placement services.

Estimated expenditures: $160,199

Funding Sources: JTPA, $82,599 (prorated based on 55% participation rate); Gateway Technical College, $22,600; P/PV, $55,000.

Recruitment approach: Mandatory referrals from the court, and referrals from intake for other Goodwill programs and from probation and parole officers.

Services provided: Education services are coordinated with Gateway Technical College and are provided on-site. Preemployment training and job placement services are also provided on-site. The curriculum is delivered once a week to two separate groups.

Specific population focus: The emphasis is on court-ordered referrals.

Other program features: There is a mothers' group that brings together some of the mothers of the young fathers' children to work through some of the same issues that the fathers are dealing with. This site has also included a series of classes on nutrition.

JUMPSTART–ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA

Contracting agency: Pinellas County Private Industry Council

Operating agency: Pinellas County Private Industry Council

Description of operating agency: The PIC serves as the grant recipient and administrative entity for JTPA in Pinellas County. As such, the PIC is responsible for the planning, oversight and operation of all JTPA programs in the county.

Staffing: One full-time case manager/facilitator, one part-time facilitator, one part-time project director.

Estimated expenditures: $126,500

Funding sources: JTPA, $71,500; P/PV, $55,000.

Recruitment approach: As in Fresno, the recruitment plan had to be modified from the original intent of recruiting solely through the local child support enforcement agency. Recruitment has broadened to include a network of community agencies, including public schools, churches, social service agencies and vocational schools.

Services provided: The fatherhood curriculum is provided in-house on a twice-weekly basis. Skills training is available through local vocational schools. Job development and placement services are provided in-house. Legal services are coordinated with a local organization, the Community Law Program, which acts as a clearinghouse for lawyers seeking to do pro bono work.

Specific population focus: 18- to 25-year-olds.

Other program features: The curriculum has been supplemented by a number of speakers and videos designed to reinforce key curriculum concepts. As in Racine, there has also been a series of classes on nutrition.

APPENDIX B

SITE SUMMARY

Program Contractor	Program Operator	Type of Operator	Primary Recruitment Strategy	Service Delivery Strategy	Estimated Expenditures	Funding Sources	Financial Support Available for Participants
Fresno PIC	Fresno County Employment Opportunities Commission	CBO	CSE (voluntary)	In-house: curriculum, job readiness, job development; Subcontract: education, skills training	$352,024	JTPA; P/PV	$30 to $90 a week
Friends of the Family	Anne Arundel County DSS	Government Agency	Community Outreach	In-house: curriculum, education; Subcontract: job readiness, skills training[1]	$79,300	Anne Arundel County DSS; P/PV	$25 to $50 a week (if in JTPA training program)
Philadelphia Children's Network	Philadelphia Children's Network	Nonprofit Coordinating Agency	Community Outreach	In-house: curriculum; Subcontract: education, skills training	$275,000	City of Philadelphia; AT&T; Scott Paper Co.; P/PV	Up to $50 a week (if in JTPA training)
Goodwill Industries	Goodwill Industries	Nonprofit Service Delivery Agency	CSE (mandatory)	In-house: curriculum; job readiness, job development, education[2]	$160,199	JTPA; Gateway Tech. College; P/PV	$15 a week + incentives
Cleveland Works	Cleveland Works	Nonprofit Service Delivery Agency	Community Outreach	In-house: curriculum, education, job readiness, job development, health	$179,907	JTPA; P/PV	$6 a day
Pinellas County PIC	Pinellas County PIC	PIC	CSE (voluntary)	In-house: curriculum, job readiness, job development	$126,500	JTPA; P/PV	0

[1] In Annapolis, education services are provided on-site by Anne Arundel County Community College.

[2] In Racine, education services are provided on-site by Gateway Technical College.

APPENDIX C

METHODOLOGY

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) used both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection for this report. P/PV program staff conducted semistructured interviews with the heads of the leading and collaborating agencies, project directors, case managers, curriculum facilitators, education instructors, employment and training specialists, legal volunteers and CSE representatives. These interviews were conducted after sites had been operational seven to 10 months. All six sites were visited every six to eight weeks by P/PV program staff, who observed curriculum sessions and other program activities and attended meetings of the agencies collaborating on the project.

Quantitative data were gathered from three sources. Each participant was administered a questionnaire by site staff at intake. The data contained in Chapter III pertaining to how the young fathers first learned about the program and why they joined are drawn from the 228 fathers who had officially enrolled by February 29, 1992 and completed the intake questionnaire.

A second source of quantitative data was a telephone survey designed by P/PV research staff and conducted by the Social Science Research Center at California State University, Fullerton, between January 13, 1992 and March 4, 1992. This survey gathered data on participant characteristics, including demographics, relationships with their children and the mothers of their children, receipt of food stamps, knowledge and use of birth control methods, neighborhood characteristics and interactions with the legal system. Interviews were attempted with 199 enrolled fathers and completed with 159 (80%).[18] Of the 40 fathers who did not participate, 35 could not be located (in many cases their phones had been disconnected or changed to an unlisted number, or they had moved and left no new telephone number or address) and five either could not be reached at home or declined through relatives to participate.

The telephone survey collected data on participants' relationships with each child and with the mother of each child. In the interest of clarity, only data concerning the fathers' relationships with their youngest child and that child's mother are reported in this interim report. The majority of fathers have children by only one mother, and more than 60 percent have only one child. The final report will include fathers' other children and other mothers in the analysis.

The third source of quantitative data was a management information system (MIS) designed to track the activities of participants in the young fathers programs. Site project directors or case managers completed monthly logs documenting each father's partic-

---

[18] An additional 29 fathers had enrolled by the end of February, but the contact information necessary to include them in the survey was not available prior to completion of the survey.

ipation in education, preemployment and skills training classes, fatherhood development activities, employment and counseling. The 159 fathers who completed the telephone survey provide the sample for analysis using the MIS data.

APPENDIX D

FATHERHOOD DEVELOPMENT CURRICULUM OUTLINE

Module One - Personal Development

I. Introduction to Fatherhood Development
Optional Session on Team-Building

II. Values

III. Manhood

IV. Stereotypes and Manhood

V. Becoming Self-Sufficient

Module Two - Life Skills

VI. Communication Skills

VII. Decision-Making Skills

Module Three - Fatherhood

VIII. Fatherhood Today

IX. Understanding the Child Support System

X. Understanding Children's Needs

XI. A Father's Influence on His Children

XII. Coping as a Single Father

Module Four - Relationships

XIII. Relationships: What Do You Want?

XIV. Conflict Resolution/Anger Management

XV. Relationships: Getting What You Want From Your Support Network

XVI. Male/Female Relationships

Module Five - Health and Sexuality

XVII. Health and Sexuality

XVIII. Substance Abuse

XIX. Putting it All Together